A LETTER TO

The Right Reverend Author of

The Divine Legation of Moſes Demonſtrated;

In Anſwer to

THE APPENDIX

To the Fifth Volume of that Work:

WITH

AN APPENDIX,

Containing a former Literary Correſpondence:

BY

A Late Profeſſor

In the UNIVERSITY of OXFORD.

Illud oro; ſi meam, cum in omni vita, tum in dicendo, moderationem modeſtiamque cognoſtis, ne me hodie, cum Iſti ut provocavit reſpondero, oblitum eſſe putetis mei. CICERO.

The FOURTH EDITION.

To which is added,

A Letter to the Reverend Doctor BROWN.

LONDON,

Printed for A. MILLAR, and J. DODSLEY.

MDCCLXVI.

by D. Lowth.

A

LETTER

TO

The Right Reverend Author of

The Divine Legation of Moſes Demonſtrated,

on Occaſion of

THE APPENDIX

To the Firſt Volume of that Work:

WITH

AN APPENDIX,

Containing a former Literary Correſpondence:

BY

A Late Profeſſor

In the UNIVERSITY of OXFORD.

Illud ego: Ædem, quæ in ærni ſolo, tum in flumb, me loratione
deûm, ædificare ſupetit, ea me facile, cum ſit ad præſentem reſpon-
dere, ædificare ſupetit. Cicero.

The FOURTH EDITION.

To which is added,

A Letter to the Reverend Doctor BROWN.

LONDON,

Printed for A. MILLAR, and J. DODSLEY.

MDCCLXVI.

TO

The Right Reverend Author

OF

The Divine Legation of Moſes Demonſtrated.

MY LORD,

I CANNOT but think myſelf much obliged to your Lordſhip, for the diſtinguiſhed honour which you have done me, in making me the ſubject of an APPENDIX to your great Work of *The Divine Legation of Moſes Demonſtrated:* an honour, which you have hitherto conferred on no one, except a late noble Lord and myſelf. I heard indeed from every quarter, that you had taken it into your head, that I had affronted you; and that this imagined affront lay rankling at your heart. You expreſſed your indignation, with much vehemence and loud menaces, to almoſt every one whom you met: except to myſelf; whom you, at the ſame time, received with fair words and a ſmooth countenance: inſomuch that I was then really perſuaded,

that what I had heard of your reſentment was all an idle and groundleſs report. However, I did not imagine, either that the ſubject on which we differed was ſo important in itſelf, or the perſon who differed from you ſo conſiderable in your eſtimation, as to merit ſo formal a proceſs, and ſo ſolemn a chaſtiſement. I thought you might poſſibly whip me at the cart's tail in a Note to *Divine Legation*, the ordinary place of your literary executions: or pillory me in the Dunciad, another engine, which, as legal proprietor, you have very ingeniouſly and judiciouſly applied to the ſame purpoſe: or perhaps have ordered me a kind of Bridewell correction by one of your Beadles, in a pamphlet. I never flattered myſelf with the expectation of being exhibited on a ſcaffold, erected on purpoſe for me, and in ſo conſpicuous a place. I can do no leſs therefore than make my acknowledgments to your Lordſhip upon the occaſion; as Sir John Owen[a] did to my Lord Preſident Bradſhaw, of inſolent and brutal memory: having, together with ſeveral Peers, received ſentence of condemnation in the High Court of Juſtice, the honeſt Knight made a low reverence to his mock Lordſhip, and gave him humble thanks for the great honour done him in being condemned to loſe his head like a noble Lord; for, being but a poor Gentleman of Wales, he ſwore he was afraid he ſhould have been hanged.

[a] Clarendon's Hiſt. Vol. iii, p. 267. 8vo.

Having

Having thus paid all due reſpects and acknowledgments to your Lordſhip, I ſhall proceed, without further compliments and with all proper freedom, to inquire into the grounds of your reſentment, and the merits of the queſtion in diſpute.

You complain [b], as if I had attacked you in a certain Note of mine. How ſo, my Lord? My Note expreſsly referred to an anonymous book intitled, *A Free and Candid Examination of the Biſhop of London's Sermons*, &c. in which I was ſeveral times called to account, with a peculiar air of inſolence, that marks the controverſial writings which come from a certain quarter. I anſwered ſuch of the Candid Examiner's objections, as I thought at all worth anſwering: for as to the long Note of ſeven pages in the ſame book [c], wholly founded upon the author's not being able to conſtrue a plain ſentence in Latin, I thought it would be offering an affront to the underſtanding of my Readers to go out of my way to confute it. And pray, my Lord, what is all this to You? You will ſay perhaps, They were my Arguments? And pray, what is that to me? They were urged againſt me by the Candid Examiner, and againſt him I directed my anſwer: if they had come immediately from You, I would have directed my anſwer to You. If I had taken the contrary method, and fallen upon You inſtead of the Candid Examiner; you might then with ſome reaſon have repreſented me as a petulant

[b] Appendix, p. 415. [c] P. 278, &c.

and

and quarrelſome fellow, who had attacked you " without the leaſt provocation given." As it is; I leave it to the unprejudiced to judge, whether you have any pretence at all for your complaint againſt me.

Beſides, my Lord, I may appeal to your own judgment in this caſe: you repreſent me, as diſputing with the Candid Examiner in the firſt part of the Note; you ſay, that then " I proceed to the " Author of the Divine Legation;" and that at laſt " I turn to the Examiner again." Now if any part of my Note relate to You, it muſt be the firſt and laſt parts, rather than the middle part: for the argument from the puniſhment of Idolatry by the Judge, is yours; or rather Mr Locke's, adopted by You, and taken up at third hand by the Candid Examiner: the argument from the puniſhment of the Fathers crime upon the Children, is yours; and from you retailed by the ſame: the middle argument from the antique caſt of the Poem has leſs immediate relation to You, than either of the foregoing; it is a general defence of my theſis, or, if you pleaſe, a general objection to yours, not oppoſed to any particular argument that you have uſed. Now you have plainly acquitted me of any reflection upon You in the former inſtances, for in thoſe you take up the cauſe as your client's, the Candid Examiner's, and not as your own; therefore, to be conſiſtent with yourſelf, you muſt acquit me upon the other charge alſo.

Well:

Well: but after all you may ſay, that this is a mere evaſion; and that I muſt know, that in the preſent caſe, to attack the Candid Examiner, or You, was in effect the ſame thing. Why really, my Lord, there is ſome truth in this: I did indeed ſuppoſe, that there was an intimate union between You and the Candid Examiner. I could not but obſerve the ſame cauſe managed much in the ſame manner, and much of the ſame ſpirit breathing in both. His book came forth at leaſt with your approbation: you clapt upon its head a *Prologus galeatus*, (for the Public, I believe, was not miſtaken when it aſcribed the Preface to You;) and while little Teucer ſhot at all the Leaders of Troy, and had the vain ambition to think of vanquiſhing the great Hector himſelf, he ſculked behind the ſhade of the mighty Telamonian Shield,

—— —— "with ſeven thick folds o'ercaſt
"Of tough Bull-hides; of ſolid Braſs the laſt."

I preſume, my Lord, that the Candid Examiner is the ſame perſon whom your Lordſhip, in regard to his former ſervices, ſome time ſince preferred to the honourable office of being your Literary Scavenger; whoſe Patent ſtands upon record at the end of the Second Preface to the Second Part of *Divine Legation*. I applaud your choice: you could not eaſily have found a perſon more expert, not only in raking up dirt, but (which is a ſtill more uſeful qualification) in throwing it too, than this Candid Gentleman: and it muſt be ſuppoſed, that your connection

connection with him is of the cloſeſt nature. Still further, my Lord; I will confeſs, that I think it probable, as from other marks, ſo in particular from a notion which very often poſſeſſes this Writer's imagination, that all Authors whatever, while they are writing, think of no body but You; and, whatever opinions they advance, or confute, they aim at nothing but *Divine Legation*[d]: from hence, I ſay, I think it probable, that You had ſome hand in the book itſelf. But till you publickly acknowledge all this, and lay in your claim to your ſhare of the performance; I ſhall ſtill think, that any one, who has any matters to ſettle with the Candid Examiner, is quite at liberty to do it in what manner he thinks proper, without being in the leaſt accountable to your Lordſhip for ſo doing.

So much for the caſe, as it lies before the Public. I muſt now remind your Lordſhip of what has formerly paſt between us in private, concerning theſe ſame matters. In my Lectures on the Hebrew

[d] For example. "If they do," [no matter, who, or what] "how can he pretend, that the Jewiſh notion of a futurity "*makes any thing againſt the doctrine of D. L.*" Examin. p. 284. —— "Now, whether it would be worth while to give "up all theſe things," [that is, all the Prophecies both literal and typical] "*for the ſake of oppoſing the principles of the D.* "*L.* muſt be ſubmitted to the judgment of others." P. 124. As for the firſt of theſe paſſages, I can anſwer for the Perſon there meant; that, in the place referred to, he never pretended any ſuch thing, nor had the doctrine of D. L. in his thoughts. And of the ſecond of theſe paſſages, I dare ſay, the Learned Dr JORTIN can give much the ſame account.

Poetry

Poetry I treated of the Poem of Job, as my undertaking neceſſarily required. I gave my opinion of the age, the deſign, and the nature of the Poem, with freedom in reſpect to general ſentiments common to a number of authors, but without any reference to any one particular author, or reflection upon any perſon whatever. I was not conſcious of having given offence, nor could I ſuſpect that offence was taken. You ſignified to me, that You were offended; and called upon me to anſwer to the charge of having diſſented in opinion from You. I did not care to proteſt againſt the authoritative manner in which you proceeded; or to queſtion your inveſtiture in the high office of Inquiſitor General and Supreme Judge of the opinions of the Learned, which you had long before aſſumed, and had exerciſed with a ferocity and a deſpotiſm without example in the Republic of Letters, and hardly to be paralleled among the diſciples of Dominic; exacting their opinions to the ſtandard of your Infallibility, and proſecuting with implacable hatred every one that preſumed to differ from you. I knew, that ſuch a proteſt would lead immediately to what I was willing to avoid. I obeyed your ſummons: I gave you by Letter the account of myſelf, which you demanded; and, with due freedom, but, I hope, with civility and good manners, I aſſerted my right of thinking for myſelf; and endeavoured to remove the grounds of your reſentment. The debate ran out into ſome length; but ended in an amicable manner, which was much to my ſatisfaction. You

perhaps may ſtill ſuppoſe, that I was afraid of you. I will tell you fairly, what I was really afraid of: I was afraid, that two Members of the ſame Eccleſiaſtical Society, engaging in an open quarrel and a hoſtile altercation, (for ſuch I knew it muſt be, when You were one of the parties) upon a difference of opinion, in a point not only of no great importance, but ſo dubious as to be incapable of being perfectly ſettled between them, would make a contemptible figure, and exhibit a ridiculous ſpectacle to the Public. If this ſhould now be the caſe; I can only ſay, that it was not of my ſeeking. And that thoſe, who ſhall at all think it worth their while to inquire into the true origin and merits of this diſpute, may be able to judge who is the aggreſſor; I ſhall ſubjoin to this Addreſs the above-mentioned Literary Correſpondence, at large, and exactly as it paſſed between us.

But there is another circumſtance relating to this Correſpondence of ours, which muſt be inquired into. While I was carrying on an amicable treaty with you, at your own requiſition; I knew nothing at all of the proceedings of the Candid Examiner. His book was publiſhed about two or three months before the time, when you moved this affair: I had not ſeen it, nor had I the leaſt notice of my being at all concerned in it. Can You, my Lord, ſay the ſame thing? Did not You know, and approve of, his whole deſign? If you diſclaim all connexion with him, and diſown him as your confederate or agent; why are you angry at my taking him to

taſk,

taſk, for inſulting me? Why will You interpoſe, in our diſpute? If you cannot deny, that you had at that time ſeen his book, then newly publiſhed, and that you had ſeen it even before it was publiſhed; I think, I have reaſon to complain, that you did not deal fairly and openly with me yourſelf. You called upon me to anſwer to a charge, under pain of being chaſtiſed by You: it was too late; I had received my chaſtiſement from another hand before, with your knowledge and approbation, perhaps by your orders. You drew me into a conference, a pretended treaty of peace; while you knew, that your Cherokees and Iroquois were falling at that very time upon my back. In ſhort, my Lord, you muſt have then known; that, if I had been as well appriſed of the circumſtances of the caſe as You were, I muſt have refuſed to treat on ſuch terms. I ſhould certainly have broken off the treaty at once; and have left you to continue open hoſtilities in perſon, as you had in effect begun them by your allies. Indeed, my Lord, I was afterwards much ſurprized; when, having been with great civility diſmiſſed from your preſence, I found your Footman at your door armed with his Maſter's cane, and falling upon me without mercy, Yourſelf looking on and approving, and having probably put the weapon with proper orders into his hands, before you ſent me the invitation to an amicable conference, which I accepted. You think, it ſeems, that I ought to have taken my beating quietly and patiently; in reſpect to the livery which

he wore, and the inſtrument which he made uſe of: I was not of ſo tame a diſpoſition; I endeavoured to defend myſelf; I wreſted the weapon from him, and broke it: your Lordſhip, it ſeems, by an oblique blow in the ſcuffle, got an unlucky rap on the knuckles: tho' you may thank yourſelf for it, you lay the blame on me; you complain loudly of the injury and the inſult, and proſecute me in an action of aſſault and battery.

This is a true ſtate of my particular caſe, in this inſtance. But indeed, my Lord, it is matter of common complaint, and a real hardſhip upon us free ſubjects of the Republic of Letters in general; that we cannot go on quietly and peaceably in the public road, upon the ordinary buſineſs of our calling, without meeting at every turn a ſturdy bravo, who diſputes our paſſage, claims the highway as his own, and falls upon us with his cudgel, if we do not keep juſt to the track in which he orders us to walk. You give yourſelf out as *Demonſtrator* of *the Divine Legation of Moſes:* this ſubject you look upon as your excluſive property; by what title, I cannot ſay: ſurely not as firſt Occupier; for the Divine Legation of Moſes had been often demonſtrated before; and it would be no preſumption even in a young Student in Theology to undertake to give a better, that is, a more ſatisfactory and irrefragable Demonſtration of it in five pages, than you have done in five volumes. However, in quality of Demonſtrator General of the *Divine Legation* of

of Moſes, you lay in a further claim as Lord Paramount in all the realms of Science. For *the Divine Legation of Moſes*, it ſeems, contains in it all knowledge divine and human, antient and modern: it treats, as of its proper ſubject, *de omni ſcibili, & de quolibet ente*; it is a perfect Encyclopedia; it includes in itſelf all Hiſtory, Chronology, Criticiſm, Divinity, Law, Politics, from the Law of Moſes down to the late Jew-Bill, and from Egyptian Hieroglyphics to modern Rebus-writing; and to it we are to have recourſe, as to an infallible oracle, for the reſolution of every queſtion in Literature. It is like Lord Peter's brown loaf: it is mutton, and it is beef; it is fiſh, and it is fleſh; it is meat, and it is drink: in it are contained *incluſivè* all the neceſſaries of life; and a dreadful anathema hangs over the head of the unbeliever and gainſayer. For whatever it may pretend in theory; it admits in fact of no tolerance, no intercommunity of various ſentiments, not the leaſt difference of opinion: to diſſent, is a capital offence; to be ſilent, is a criminal reſerve; even to praiſe, unleſs in ſuch high ſtrains of Panegyric as ſhall come up to the full ſtandard of the great Proprietor's extravagant ſelf-eſtimation, argues a malignant *parſimony*, a *diſreſpect*, and an *indignity*[e]: the charge has been openly avowed, and a ſmart correction has been publicly inflicted on the offender. The Demonſtrator of *the Divine Legation* of Moſes *doth* indeed in his pre-

[e] See The Delicacy of Friendſhip; p. 47, 49.

tenſions

tenſions *beſtride the narrow world* of Literature, and hath caſt out his ſhoe over all the regions of Science. He puts me mightily in mind of King PICROCHOLE [f], when he had taken the caſtle of Clermauld; by aſſault indeed, and in all the forms, but without reſiſtance; for the place was open and defenceleſs. Upon this foundation he ſets up for Univerſal Monarchy; he makes an imaginary expedition through Europe, Africa, and Aſia; his three Miniſters, the Duc de Menüail, Count Spadaſſin, and Captain Merdaille, perſuade him, that he is the moſt puiſſant and chivalrous Prince that ever appeared ſince Alexander the Great, and that he has actually conquered all the world: and behold, he frightens the poor Pope out of his wits, and ſeizes his dominions; he vanquiſhes and baptizes Barbaroſſa; he kills and ſlays all the dog Turks and Mahometans; he gives away countries, and diſpoſes of kingdoms; and bounces, bluſters, and ſwaggers, as if he were really ſovereign Lord, and ſole Maſter of the Univerſe.

Having thus ſettled Preliminaries with your Lordſhip, I ſhall proceed directly to the matter in debate between us. And in examining your Anſwer to me, (for ſuch, I ſuppoſe, I may without impropriety call it, though I never queſtioned You about theſe matters at all) I ſhall take your Lordſhip for my guide; and try it by thoſe rules, which You have laid down, by which one may with certainty

[f] Rabelais; Liv. 1, chap. 33.

mark

mark and fix the character and denomination of an Anſwerer. Your Lordſhip, in the Preface to the *Doctrine of Grace*, ſpeaks of a mode of anſwering which conſiſts in *Sophiſtry*, *Buffoonery*, and *Scurrility*. This judicious diſtribution of the ſubject ſuits my purpoſe ſo exactly, that I muſt beg leave to borrow it. I ſhall therefore treat of your Anſwer to me under the Three Heads of *Sophiſtry*, *Buffoonery*, and *Scurrility*; which, with ſome animadverſions on the *Critical* part, towards the concluſion, which is of a character ſomewhat different, will compleatly take in the whole of your Appendix.

Firſt then for the Argumentative, that is, as I ſhall ſhew preſently, the Sophiſtical part of the Appendix. The firſt queſtion is; Whether, under the Patriarchal Government, Idolatry was puniſhed by the Magiſtrate? You hold the Negative; and your firſt argument is taken from the behaviour and character of Abraham. The argument is this: "Abraham interceded for Sodom; therefore Abra-"ham was an Advocate for Toleration." The argument, it muſt be owned, has at firſt ſight a Paradoxical appearance. The two propoſitions lie at leaſt as wide aſunder, as the Omiſſion of a Future State and the Divine Legation of Moſes. We, who are not adepts in that kind of Logic which deduces *quidlibet ex quolibet*, ſhould be a long time contriving how to bring them together. But your Lordſhip does it with all the eaſe in the world. Thus: "Abraham interceded for Sodom; the ſin

"of

" of Sodom was Idolatry; Idolatry is an Opinion; " therefore Abraham was an Advocate for Tole- " ration of Opinions." See there now, how your arguments, which your adverſaries [g] will call *Paradoxes*, turn out at once *plain, ſimple, and convincing!* And here we are obliged to your Lordſhip for quitting the round-about way of demonſtration, and giving us a ſample in the other kind: this now is the conciſe method, in which you give us to underſtand that you can excel, when you have a mind to it; " not only as *ſtrong*, but as *ſhort* too, as any " of Euclid's [h]."

There is one thing however, about which I am in ſome doubt. In your tender concern for me, you are apprehenſive, leſt I ſhould ſeem to repreſent Iſaac as an Idolater convict, and the intolerant Father laying him on the ſacrifical Pile as a kind of Patriarchal *Auto de fe:* however, as you yourſelf think, that ſuch a ſurmiſe would not be quite well founded, I am perfectly eaſy on that head. But ſuppoſe now, ſome ill-minded perſon ſhould give ſuch an invidious turn to Your argument, and inſinuate, that it tends to fix an infamous imputation on the Patriarch's character; for, if in this caſe he was an advocate for Toleration, it muſt have been for a toleration of the crime of Sodom, whatever that might be: now what that crime was, is a matter on all hands ſuppoſed to be very well known; and your putting us off with Idolatry, is only an

[g] Div. Leg. Vol. v; p. 365. [h] Ibid. p. 366.

artful

artful diſguiſe, they will ſay, thrown over your real deſign. Beſides, even this is only changing one unnatural crime for another: for your pretence, that Idolatry is but an Opinion, that the groſs Act of adoration paid to falſe Gods is a mere Speculation; this is ſuch a banter upon reaſon and common ſenſe, that you could never mean it in earneſt. The malicious therefore will be apt to ſay, that the Biſhop's argument for Toleration is all a ſham; and could be intended for nothing elſe but a libel on the good old Patriarch.

Now I have been conſidering of this matter; and there really appear to me ſome circumſtances in it that are a little untoward. If your Lordſhip is well warranted to affirm, that the ſpecific crime, which drew down God's judgments upon Sodom, was Idolatry; (and indeed without the full proof of this point, your argument is no argument at all) you muſt have had your information from Holy Scripture: for in this caſe there is no other evidence to be had, or none in the leaſt worth regarding. Now I have looked from the beginning of the Bible to the end, to ſee if I could find any thing to this purpoſe; but in vain. Beſide the hiſtory of the deſtruction of that City[i], which clearly enough marks the deteſtable crime for which it was deſtroyed, and ſome other paſſages[k] confirming the ſame thing; Sodom is often introduced as an image to expreſs either the ſeverity of God's judgments in the utter

[i] Gen. xix. [k] Iſaiah iii, 9. Ezek. xvi; 49, 50. Jude 7.

deſtruction of abandoned ſinners, or the height of vice and iniquity in general, without relation to the particular kind of it: nor can I find one place, where Sodom is charged with the crime of Idolatry. And as to the other medium of proof, that Idolatry is an Opinion; I muſt own, I am not able to make it out cleverly. But when your Lordſhip ſhall be pleaſed to reſume the queſtion, and treat it in the round-about method of demonſtration, which after all is Your *fort*, theſe difficulties will all vaniſh; and, I dare ſay, from the ſimple poſition, Abraham interceded for Sodom, you will be able not only to deduce the above-mentioned conſequence, but moreover, and full as well too, any given concluſion whatſoever.

However, my Lord, there is another remark, which I could ſuggeſt, that would entirely obviate this invidious inſinuation; but then unfortunately it will at the ſame time wholly overthrow your argument. It is this: it appears plainly from the narrative of Moſes, that Abraham's exception to God's dealing with Sodom was not from an opinion of the undue rigour and ſeverity of it, but from a ſcruple ſolely reſpecting the juſtice of God in deſtroying the righteous together with the wicked. His concern was not for the wicked, but for the righteous: he interceded for the wicked merely for the ſake of the righteous; and cannot properly be ſaid to have interceded for the wicked on their own account at all. So that Abraham's interceſſion had

no

no relation to the particular crime, to the kind or the meaſure of guilt, of the offenders. To inquire therefore, whether it were the one or the other of the two unnatural crimes here meant; or whether the one or the other of them has moſt the nature of a Speculative Opinion, which might be a hard matter clearly to determine: this would be nothing at all to the purpoſe. The only ſpeculative point, that Abraham's thoughts were engaged in, was, Whether it was agreeable to God's juſtice to involve the righteous and the wicked together in the ſame judicial deſtruction? This is the only queſtion, that ariſes from Moſes's plain ſtate of the caſe; and this is totally foreign to the preſent ſubject of debate.

But, I have not yet done with this argument: it is ſo curious a one, that it deſerves to be examined on all ſides. And here I ſhall look back a little, to obſerve how you uſher it in: and, now I am about it, I ſhall take my retroſpect from your firſt paragraph.

Your Lordſhip ſets out with ſaying, that I BEG THE QUESTION. Now as to this matter; any of our Readers will be as able, as You or I, to judge, whether I *beg* the queſtion, or only *propoſe* it: and to their judgment I ſhall therefore leave it. Yet I cannot but take notice, how ſoon you betray your diſtreſs in this diſpute. This formidable objection you place in the van of your forces; and in truth it has as much ſtrength in it, as any part of the whole corps: but behold, before you have advanced much beyond the middle of the paragraph, you

grow aſhamed of it, deſert it, and ſurrender it at diſcretion.

In the next place, your Lordſhip is pleaſed to be merry with the old Patriarchs. But this part, however deficient in Logic, I ſhall paſs by at preſent: it belongs rather to my Second Head. You then betake yourſelf to what you yourſelf call [l] one of "the ſmall arts of controverſy;" that is, "diſ-"honouring perſons by putting them into ill com-"pany." Thus, ſay you, "Atheiſts and Divines "are well paired" by Lord Bolingbroke: and thus, ſay I, "Hobbes and our Profeſſor" are as well matched by your Lordſhip. This, I obſerve, is quite a Common-place with you. Juſt now while I am writing, chancing to dip in one of your volumes [m], I find you treat a learned Profeſſor of Cambridge in the very ſame manner. Hobbes and the Profeſſor go hand in hand together, as if they were ſworn brothers; and a few pages farther on, I ſee the ſame Gentleman is got in company with "Toland, Tindal, Collins, and the whole tribe of "Free-thinkers [n]." You have, it ſeems, a ſet of Names always at hand, a kind of infamous Liſt, or black Calendar, where every offender is ſure to find a nich ready to receive him: nothing ſo eaſy as the application, and ſlight provocation is ſufficient. A Gentleman, juſtly reſpectable on account of his very eminent genius and learning, and ſtill more

[l] View of Bolingbroke's Philoſophy, p. 137.
[m] Div. Leg. Vol. iv; p. 272. [n] Ibid. p. 309.

reſpect-

reſpectable in his moral character; whoſe Name, for certain other reaſons alſo, you have done very prudently not to diſcloſe, either by expreſs mention, or by reference: this very worthy perſon chanced to drop an expreſſion concerning Polemic Divinity, which You allow to be innocent and free from all malice, yet thought it looked a little diſreſpectfully towards a Profeſſion in which You make ſo great a figure: you therefore took the firſt opportunity of falling upon him, as if he had been guilty of Blaſphemy: you treated him as an ignorant ſmall-dealer in ſecond-hand ridicule, and ſtrung him up in public, as a Scoffer at things ſacred, with Collins, Tindal, Shafteſbury, and Bolingbroke [o].

But, to return to Hobbes and our Profeſſor: for my part, my Lord, I have no ſort of objection to Mr Hobbes's company, provided he behave decently and properly, and talk like a learned and a ſenſible man; and I had as lief ſay a thing after him as after another, provided the thing be true. And really Hobbes was a man of great learning and abilities: You Yourſelf [p] have done him the juſtice to ſpeak of him, as "one of the firſt men of his age "for a bright wit, a deep penetration, and a cul-"tivated underſtanding;" and have remarked (what had indeed occurred to me in reading him before I ſaw your remark) that "Mr Locke re-

[o] See *Doctrine of Grace*, p. 309.

[p] WARBURTON's Miſcellaneous Tranſlations in Proſe and Verſe, from Roman Poets, Orators, and Hiſtorians. London, 1724; 12mo. See p. 123.

"ceived

" ceived no ſmall aſſiſtance from Mr Hobbes's no-
" tions." But after all; how is it that I and my friend Hobbes (who agree ſo well *in eodem tertio*, " in not having been bred up in the Principles of " Toleration," and are ſo fitly yoked together) concur in ſentiment ſo lovingly? I ſay, that Abraham had a right to reſtrain his Family from Idolatry, from a ſpecies of Falſe Worſhip condemned by Natural Religion, and productive of infinite Corruptions both religious and moral: Hobbes, as you quote him, " holds, that Abraham had a right to " preſcribe to his Family, what Religion they " ſhould be of;" that is, whether true or falſe, for here is no limitation. So that it appears at laſt, that there juſt as much difference between Hobbes and our Profeſſor upon this point, as there is between a right of impoſing upon another a Falſe Religion, and a right of reſtraining another from practices of a Falſe Religion in themſelves immoral and ſinful.

And now for your argument from Abraham's conduct, at large, and in your own words. " But " God ſpeaking of Abraham, ſays, *I know that he* " *will command his children and his houſhold after him,* " *and they ſhall keep the way of the Lord*, &c. Gen. " xviii, 19. And Hobbes and our *Profeſſor*, I ſuppoſe, regard this declaration as a clear proof of " the divine doctrine of RESTRAINT in matters of " Religion; eſpecially when interpreted by *their* " *darling text* of —— *Force them to enter in.* On " the contrary, thoſe who have been bred up in " the

" the Principles of *Toleration*, hold it to be a mere
" teſtimony (a glorious one indeed) of Abraham's
" pious and parental care to INSTRUCT his family
" in the Law of God. And it is well, it can go
" for no more, or I ſhould fear the learned Profeſ-
" ſor would have brought in Iſaac as a backſlider
" to Idolatry; and his Father's laying him on the
" ſacrifical Pile, as a kind of Auto de fe. Now,
" except in theſe two places of Abraham's Hiſtory,
" of ſuch wonderful force to ſupport *intolerant*
" principles, the Patriarch appears in all others ſo
" averſe to this inquiſitorial ſpirit, that where God
" comes down to deſtroy Sodom, the *Father of the*
" *Faithful* intercedes, with the utmoſt importunity,
" for that *idolatrous* as well as inceſtuous City. The
" truth is this, The uſurped right of puniſhing for
" opinions, was firſt aſſumed and long ingroſſed
" by Idolaters. And, if tradition may be believed,
" Abraham himſelf narrowly eſcaped the *Fire* for
" preaching againſt its Divinity [p]."

" The inſolence, the fraud, the nonſenſe of this
" paſſage [q]" ——— I beg pardon, my Lord; I have been juſt reading in the Notes to *Divine Legation*, and ere I was aware have fallen into the ſame language.

[p] Appendix, Div. Leg. Vol. v; p. 412, 413.

[q] Divine Legation, Vol. v; p. 19. The very learned and ingenious Perſon, of whom this decent language is uſed, is the Rev. Mr PETERS. I mention his name, becauſe the Readers of *Divine Legation* will hardly know it from thence; where he paſſes by the ſtyle and title of the *Corniſh Critic*. What the true meaning and import of this title may be, I cannot ſay. I ſuppoſe it may allude to ſome Proverbial ſaying

language. I meant to ſay, that I muſt beg leave to point out, in the foregoing paſſage, the candid reflections, the imputed principles, and the ingenious conſequence from the Profeſſor's ſuppoſed way of reaſoning with regard to the important point of the Sacrifice of Iſaac: and to obſerve, how artfully the foreign term *Idolatrous* ſlides into the main argument; and with what eaſe the tranſition is made to *Opinions*; which term, though it could not well appear in the main argument, yet is brought up by way of reinforcement in the rear. "The uſurped "right of puniſhing for opinions," ſays your Lordſhip, "was firſt aſſumed by Idolaters." It may be ſo; but what this has to do with the Profeſſor, who maintains no ſuch right, I do not ſee: however, you cite an antient Tradition to prove it. As you think proper to produce this Tradition in evidence; I ſuppoſe, it muſt be of ſome weight and well ſupported. And I find it is ſo: it is delivered by a great number of authors, and has been as univerſally received as any thing of the kind perhaps ever was. It prevailed throughout the Eaſt; it was adopted by Mahomet[r]; Maimonides records it[s],

ing relating to Cornwall, perhaps like that of the Jews, equally falſe, concerning Galilee; that out of Cornwall ariſeth no Critic: but this is mere conjecture; I have never heard of any ſuch Proverb. I was thinking of explaining it by another common ſaying; but then the title would imply a commendation, and, what is worſe, would have too great a propriety. Every one has heard of a *Corniſh Hug*; which, if a man has once felt it to the purpoſe, he will be ſore of as long as he lives.

[r] See Sale's Koran, Chap. xxi, p. 268.

[s] De Idololatria; Cap. 1, Sect. vii, viii. Edit. Dionyſ. Voſſii.

with

with many other Jewiſh Writers; and the Eaſtern Chriſtians [t] regarded it ſo far, as even to ſet apart the 25th of January (which appears by the Syrian Calendar) in commemoration of Abraham's being caſt into the fire, and miraculouſly eſcaping from it. Let us then ſee, what this Tradition ſays; and let us have the whole of it; for your Lordſhip has reported it very imperfectly, and without referring to any author. Now I ſhall venture to cite, upon this occaſion, the very learned HYDE; although You, with that contempt and indignity, with which you treat the greateſt and moſt reſpectable names in the Republic of Letters, if they happen to diſpleaſe you, have placed him at the head of "a rabble of "lying Orientaliſts [u]." His ſummary account of the matter is as follows [w]: "Quòd autem Abra-"hamus cum Chaldæis acriter contendebat de Re-"ligione, eſt proclive creditu: & præterea Hiſto-"rici, tam alii Orientales, quàm Judæi, id unani-"miter affirmant & multis exponunt. Tradunt "enim Abrahamum omni Idololatriæ ſe acriter "oppoſuiſſe, & cum omnibus ejuſdem falſi cultûs "Aſſeclis, etiam Magnatibus, contendiſſe; eò uſ-"que dum apud Regem (qui ſupradictus *Nimrod*) "accuſatus & acriter objurgatus fuit: & cum ſæpe "admonitus noluit abſtinere, in carcerem & tan-"dem in foveam ignis conjectus eſt." And the

[t] See Sale's Notes on the Koran, ibid.
[u] Doctrine of Grace, p. 324.
[w] De Relig. Vet. Perſ. Cap. 2. p. 69.

Arabic, Perſic, and Jewiſh Writers relate in particular[x], that he threw down and brake to pieces the Images, and burned the Temples, of the Idolaters. You ſeem to approve of Abraham's behaviour on this occaſion, by repreſenting him as ſuffering unjuſtly for it: and though he did ſomething more than preach the true Religion, yet I ſhould think, that the breaking to pieces of Idols, and the burning of Temples, come within the definition of a mere ſpeculative opinion, as much as the acts of Adoration and Sacrifice in an Idol Temple. Now all this was while he was yet in Chaldea, a country where Idolatry was the eſtabliſhed worſhip; himſelf a private perſon, and ſubject to the laws of his country, and to his rightful prince; yet in oppoſition to all earthly authority, he uſed his utmoſt endeavours to extirpate Idolatry, and to introduce the true Religion. And would You have the ſame Abraham, when free from theſe reſtraints, and ruling his own people, ſit ſtill and ſupinely ſuffer the introduction of Idol worſhip into his own family, and among his own dependents? All that I would require of him is, that in this new ſituation, and under additional obligations of duty, he ſhould exert equal zeal in the ſame cauſe, which he might now do with greater propriety; and as a governor prevent the introduction of that falſe worſhip, from which even as a private man he (according to the Tradition cited by your Lordſhip) ſo laudably and

[x] See Sale's Koran; p. 268: Hyde, ibid. p. 69, 71, 72: Maimonides, ibid.

merito-

meritoriouſly endeavoured to reclaim his countrymen.

So much for your Lordſhip's firſt argument. I proceed now to your ſecond; which lies a good deal more open and unembarraſſed, and will give me much leſs trouble. This too ariſes from a piece of Hiſtory [y]. Jacob and his Family depart from Laban. Rachel ſteals away her Father's Gods, and carries them off. The old man follows and overtakes them, and complains of the theft. Jacob, to give all poſſible ſatisfaction, permits him to ſearch the whole company, and among the reſt his wife Rachel, of whom he has not the leaſt ſuſpicion. Rachel by a female ſtratagem conceals the Gods, and the theft remains undiſcovered. And what, in the name of wonder, has this to do with Jacob's having, or not having, a right to puniſh Idolatry? Oh, ſay you, "Rachel contrived to keep her Fa-"ther's Gods, for no better purpoſe, *we may be* "*ſure*, than that for which the good man employed "ſo much pains to recover them." Soft and fair, my Lord; not quite ſo ſure neither: no begging of the queſtion, I beſeech you. You cried out upon me juſt now, before you had the leaſt reaſon to be alarmed; and now you make no ſcruple of availing yourſelf of this poor fallacy in the moſt open manner. Unleſs you are abſolutely ſure, unleſs you prove beyond all doubt, that Rachel ſtole her Father's Gods for Idolatrous purpoſes; this whole caſe

[y] Gen. xxxi.

is totally foreign to the point in queſtion: and has no more to do with Idolatry, than it has with murder or inceſt; or even than the laſt caſe, which you brought, had to do with it. And pray, my Lord, how came You to be ſo ſure of Rachel's deſign? Moſes has not given the leaſt hint of it: and in ſuch a caſe, what ſignify the conjectures of his Expoſitors? However, conjecture they will; and their conjectures, as one may well expect, are various and contradictory. Some ſay [z], that ſhe took away her Father's Idols, leſt by conſulting them he ſhould find out which way they had fled: others [a], that ſhe ſtole them merely for the value of the gold and ſilver, of which they were made. Joſephus ſays [b], ſhe took them not to worſhip them, "for her huſ-"band had taught her to deſpiſe ſuch worſhip of "falſe Gods; but that, if her Father ſhould over-"take them, ſhe might betake herſelf to theſe Idols "for protection, and by their means obtain for-"giveneſs." Others ſuppoſe [c], that out of her great zeal againſt Idolatry ſhe deprived her Father of his Idols, to prevent his continuing in that practice; and to draw him from it, by making him ſenſible of the weakneſs of his Gods, who could not preſerve themſelves. Others [d] again on the con-

[z] R. Eliezer, Aben Ezra, Ben. Nachman, De Muis, Menochius, &c.

[a] Aſterius, Pererius, Oſiander, &c.

[b] Antiq. Lib. 1, cap. 9.

[c] Baſil. Hom. xii. 12 in Princip. Proverb. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. 42. & Nicetas in loc. Theodoret. &c.

[d] Chryſoſtom. Corn. a Lapide, Mercerus, Rivetus, &c.

trary

trary think, that ſhe deſigned to make the ſame uſe of them herſelf, that her Father had done. Of theſe uncertain conjectures it is hard to determine which is the moſt probable; but it not hard to determine, which is the moſt improbable of them all: for to that preeminence the laſt, which your Lordſhip has adopted, has much the faireſt claim: not only becauſe, as you obſerved yourſelf, when you thought it ſomething for your purpoſe to make the obſervation [e], "that Jacob took care to inſtruct "his Wives in the true Religion;" but alſo becauſe it plainly appears from the preceding Chapter [f], that Rachel, in particular, was a ſerious and faithful Worſhipper of Jehovah, the true and only God: a ſtrong preſumption at leaſt in her favour, that ſhe was not at this time addicted to any Idolatrous practices. And ſo, what becomes now of your Lordſhip's argument?

But let us ſee how you will manage it, ſuppoſing we allow you all you want; the very point, which you ſhould have proved, but took for granted at firſt. Be it ſo then: Rachel ſtole her Father's Gods, with a deſign to worſhip them. Search was made, and nothing at all was diſcovered: not even the theft; much leſs the Idolatry, which was the ſecret motive, and in time to be the conſequence of the theft. So, as far as I can ſee, we are not a whit the wiſer, or the nearer to the reſolution of the queſ-

[e] Div. Leg. Vol. v; p. 76. [f] Gen. xxx; 22—24.

tion,

tion, Whether Idolatry was puniſhed by the Patriarchs, or not. Rachel, you ſay, was not puniſhed for Idolatry: I anſwer, She was never proved guilty of it. But Jacob did not even denounce condemnation on the offender, for the Idolatrous intention, if it ſhould be found out: I anſwer, that it does not appear, that he had the leaſt ſuſpicion of any ſuch intention. He certainly did not ſuſpect his beſt-beloved wife Rachel: this is plain from his anſwer to Laban, *With whomſoever thou findeſt thy Gods, let him not live.* Let us ſee now how the caſe plainly ſtands, and how your argument ariſes from it. Rachel was not burnt alive, nor in any way puniſhed, by the ſentence of her huſband the Patriarch Jacob, for Idolatry; of which ſhe was neither convicted, nor accuſed, nor ſo much as ſuſpected: therefore Idolatry was not puniſhed by the Patriarchs. A Highwayman eſcapes hanging in England, being never proved guilty, never committed, never found out: therefore there is no law in England againſt robbery on the highway. Why, my Lord, even that zealous aſſertor of juſtice, and voluntary executor of law, the Mob, never diſciplines a pick-pocket, unleſs caught in the fact; and do You ſuppoſe, that I take the Patriarchs for ſuch intolerant zealots, as to condemn their people to the fire for Idolatry upon the leaſt ſuſpicion, and even upon no ſuſpicion at all? Oh but, ſay you, 'Rachel *to be ſure* was guilty of Idolatrous intentions; and *to be ſure*, ſhe would ſoon put her intentions in practice; and *to be ſure*, ſuch practices

'from

'from their nature could not be long hid; and *to* 'be *ſure*, if ſhe had been puniſhed for it, the Scrip-'ture would have taken notice of it: therefore, 'the ſilence of Scripture ſhews it to have been *co-'ram non judice*. Q. E. D.' My Lord, I beg leave to ſuggeſt a ſmall emendation of what I ſuppoſe to be an error of the preſs, in the Concluſion of your Demonſtration; for *coram non judice*, read, *non coram judice:* that is the plain truth of the matter; and that, I promiſe you, is all that you will ever be able to make of it.

We have ſeen that the two firſt caſes, which you have produced from the Patriarchal Hiſtory, are not at all to the purpoſe: the third caſe, which immediately follows, is indeed very much ſo; and quite determines the queſtion —— againſt your Lordſhip. It is no uncommon thing for an experienced Polemic, when he is diſtreſſed by an untoward text, that lies in open view, full in the face of the Reader, and juſt acroſs his argument, to ſlip it out of ſight, and convey it away, and keep it under cover with as much dexterity and ſlight of hand, as a Juggler employs with his cups and balls. But here, all is fair and above board; the caſe is plainly laid before us; and we have nothing to do, but to ſee which way it tends, and what is the conſequence directly reſulting from it. "Jacob at Bethel, in pious emula-"tion of his Grand-father's *care to keep the way of the* "*Lord*, commanded[g] *his houſhold, and all that were*

[g] Gen. xxxv, 2.

"*with*

" *with him, to put away the ſtrange Gods from among* " *them.*" Now let us ſee your deduction from it. " They obeyed, all was well; and not a word of " *puniſhing by the Judge.*" Puniſhing, my Lord! for what, I beſeech you? For putting away the ſtrange Gods, as they were commanded to do? Juſt now you were for having poor Rachel puniſhed, for nothing at all but your own ſuſpicions; here you go ſtill further, and expect that the people ſhould be puniſhed even for their Obedience. " They obeyed, and all was well." But, ſuppoſe they had not obeyed; would all have been well then? A Command iſſued by a Superior, in an authoritative manner, and in due form, plainly implies a right, and a power, and a will, to inforce obedience to the command: the Patriarch iſſues a Command againſt Idolatry; therefore the Patriarch had a right, and a power, to puniſh Idolatry; and would have puniſhed it in thoſe, whom he ſhould have found guilty of the crime.

Here then is the example required: and thus ſtands the Fact atteſted by Sacred Hiſtory. Jacob, a Ruler of a Tribe, aſſumes, as ſuch, a power of reſtraining and prohibiting, and conſequently of puniſhing, Idolatry. He forbids not only the public worſhip, but the private uſe, and ſecret poſſeſſion, of Idols: the people acknowledge this power by immediately obeying his command, by ſurrendering to him their Idols, and every other mark and adjunct of falſe worſhip: and I add, that his

duty

duty [h] and engagements to God, his ſituation amongſt nations addicted to the groſſeſt Idolatries, and the diſpoſition of his own people, inclined to Idolatry, (as appears by their having theſe abominations in their hands) ſufficiently juſtify him in aſſuming and exerciſing ſuch a power.

The three preceding arguments are built upon a very extraordinary principle, quite of your own invention; namely, That clear proof ariſes from a total want of evidence. How greatly is the learned World obliged to your Lordſhip for the curious diſcoveries, which you are perpetually communicating; New Canons of Logic, as well as New Canons of Criticiſm!

After two paragraphs, one of the Ludicrous, the other of the Scurrilous kind, which I reſerve therefore for my Second and Third Heads; your Lordſhip proceeds to hint, or refer to, rather than to draw out in form, an argument of another ſort. "As theſe Patriarchs *did not de facto* (which appears from their hiſtory) ſo they *could not de jure* (which appears from the laws of Nature and Nations) *puniſh Idolatry by the Judge.*"

We have ſeen how the Fact ſtands, as it appears from their Hiſtory: and I muſt obſerve, that the proof of the Fact is ſufficient for my purpoſe, without the juſtification of it. The true Job, or rather the Author of the Poem of Job, equal or prior in

[h] See Gen. xxviii; 20—22.

time to Moſes, might expreſs what was the received opinion and practice of his age, however iniquitous that opinion and practice might be: he might ſpeak of Idolatry as puniſhed by the Judge[i], though the Judges of that age might exceed their commiſſion in puniſhing it. But as I think, not only that the Patriarchs did exerciſe their authority in reſtraining Idolatrous Worſhip, but that they might alſo do it without being ſuch inquiſitors and perſecutors as You would in that caſe repreſent them to have been; I ſhall conſider your argument from the Laws of Nature and Nations, and ſee what may be pleaded in their behalf upon thoſe principles.

I ſhall conſider the Law of Nature and the Law of Nations with regard to this caſe diſtinctly. "Ido-"latry," you ſay, "is not puniſhable by the Law "of Nations." Granted: one Nation has no right to puniſh another Nation for Idolatry; for one Nation has no juriſdiction over another Nation, nor any right to puniſh, but what ariſes from the right of ſelf-preſervation and ſelf-defence. Jacob therefore, as head of a tribe or nation, had no right to invade another tribe or nation, becauſe they were Idolaters: the Iſraelites would have had no right to extirpate the Canaanites for Idolatry, unleſs they

[i] Job xxxi, 28. I do not enter into a Critical examination of this Text, which many learned men explain otherwiſe; as not implying any Judicial Puniſhment. The preſent queſtion proceeds upon the ſenſe given in our Tranſlation; which ſeems the moſt obvious, and therefore is perhaps the moſt probable.

had

had been impowered by a ſpecial commiſſion from God for that purpoſe.

Again; "Idolatry," you ſay, "is not puniſh-"able by the Law of Nature." This is not quite ſo clear. Idolatry is a crime againſt the Light of Nature, and therefore againſt the Law of Nature. That the Idolatry in queſtion, the antient Heathen Idolatry, was ſuch, I prove from St Paul. "That "which may be known of God (ſays the Apoſtle[k]) "is manifeſt in them, (the Gentiles;) for God "hath ſhewed it unto them. For the inviſible "things of him from the creation of the world are "clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that "are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; "ſo that they are without excuſe: becauſe that "when they knew God, they glorified him not as "God; but —— changed the glory of the un-"corruptible God into an image made like to cor-"ruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed "beaſts, and creeping things." And the Analogy between the crime and the puniſhment of it, which the Apoſtle urges with great force and elegance, ariſes from this very conſideration, that their Idolatry was a crime againſt the Law of Nature. God, who cauſeth the wicked "to eat of the fruit of "their own way, and to be filled with their own "devices," puniſhed theſe Sinners, ſo ſtupidly undiſcerning in reſpect to His Nature, with a mind as ſtupidly undiſcerning in reſpect of their own. As,

[k] Rom. 1; 19—23.

againſt the light of their reaſon, they had changed the glory of God into a lie; ſo, as much againſt the ſame light, they were given up to belie their own nature: as they unnaturally turned God into a beaſt, ſo they turned themſelves by unnatural abuſes into worſe than beaſts. The ſame Apoſtle[l] reckons Idolatry, the ſame Heathen Idolatry, among *the works of the fleſh*; "Adultery, fornication, un-"cleanneſs, laſciviouſneſs, *idolatry* —— and ſuch "like." And Mr Locke[m], making the ſame enumeration, which I have here expreſſed, from the Apoſtle, calls them all together "*Immoralities*, un-"becoming the name of a Chriſtian, and ſuch as "ought to be rooted out." I ſhall add but one authority more, upon a point clear enough in itſelf; and it ſhall be one, which I am ſure you will allow to be beyond all exception, that is, your own. In this very Volume[n], you ſpeak of antient Heathen Idolatry, as a ſpecies of *Immorality*. And I the rather think this to be your real opinion, and true judgment upon the caſe, becauſe you give it by way of example and illuſtration, without any immediate view of ſerving a cauſe; notwithſtanding that juſt now, in the preceding page of the Appendix[o], for the ſake of your argument, you oppoſed Civil Crimes and Immoralities to Idolatry, as of a nature totally different. The Idolatry then in queſtion being an Immorality, and a crime againſt the Law of

[l] Gal. v; 19, 20.
[m] Letter concerning Toleration, p. 34. Edit. 1765. 4to.
[n] Vol. v, p. 265. [o] P. 414.

Nature;

Nature; it ſhould ſeem, that it is puniſhable by the Law of Nature.

But, that this matter may ſtand in a ſtill clearer light; I ſhall bring it forward, and purſue it one ſtep further. The Law of Nature may be conſidered as operating either in a State of Nature, or in a State of Civil Society. Idolatry in a State of Nature is a crime againſt the Law of Nature: but in a State of Nature one man is to another, as one independent nation is to another; one man has no right to hurt another, except in the caſe of ſelf-defence; in the repulſion, the prevention, or the reparation, of injuries. The right of executing the Law of Nature, by puniſhing crimes committed againſt it, which belongs to every man in a State of Nature, cannot be properly exerted in the reſtraining of crimes, which are indirectly and by remote conſequence only detrimental to the community: for every private perſon cannot be ſuppoſed to be a proper judge of ſuch conſequences. Idolatry therefore in a State of Nature, though a crime againſt the Law of Nature, muſt yet be left to the judgment of God; ſeeing there is no human juriſdiction, which can properly interpoſe to reſtrain it.

But in a State of Civil Society, which is ſuppoſed in this queſtion, this defect is ſupplied: the Civil Law is ſuperinduced, and comes in aid of the Natural Law; and puts it in execution in many inſtances, in which it could not be executed before. The Magiſtrate becomes "the miniſter of God, an

"avenger

" avenger to execute wrath upon every one that " doeth evil;" upon every vice, every immorality, every crime againſt the Law of Nature; as far as it may have a pernicious effect upon Civil Society, and as far as it can come under his Cogniſance. The Legiſlative Power is the only proper judge to determine, what vices are ſo pernicious to Civil Society, as not to be ſafely overlooked; and what vices are in their nature ſo capable of proof, as to be properly cogniſable by the Civil Magiſtrate. The Idolatry then in queſtion, as a crime againſt the Law of Nature, of the firſt magnitude, of the moſt peſtilential influence, a crime open, notorious, and capable of legal conviction, is a proper object of his animadverſion. " The worſhipping of Idols," ſays the Author of the Book of Wiſdom [p], " is the be- " ginning, the cauſe, and the end, of all evil:" and the horrible conſequences, which he there lays to its charge, are abundantly verified by the authority of Holy Scripture, and by the teſtimony of all Hiſtory, Profane as well as Sacred. You tell us, that " it is not amenable to civil Juſtice;" that before the Magiſtrate " it is *coram non judice*;" and that puniſhing for Idolatry is " puniſhing for *Opi-* " *nions.*" When you were arguing againſt Lord Bolingbroke you ſeem to have conſidered this matter in another light, and to have entertained a different opinion of it; and, what is more, you ſupported your opinion with a good reaſon. Your

[p] Wiſd. xiv, 27. See alſo Lev. xviii; 21 — 25. Deut. xviii; 10 — 12. Rom. 1; 26 — 32.

words

words are theſe[q]: "But he (Lord Bolingbroke) "ſhould have conſidered, that the LAW all along "diſtinguiſhes between the crimes capable of legal "conviction, and ſuch as were inſcrutable to all "but Omniſcience. The latter God reſerves for "his own Inquiſition: but the crime in queſtion "was *an overt-act of Idolatrous Worſhip*, and *there-* "*fore* came *reaſonably and equitably* before the Civil "Tribunal." You indeed mean here the Moſaic Law, and the Civil Tribunal under the Moſaic Government; but the force of your reaſoning extends to every Law, and to every Civil Government, upon the face of the earth.

I ſee, your Lordſhip treats of this matter more at large in another place[r]; to which, I ſuppoſe, you would here refer us. I have examined it attentively; but find as little ſatisfaction there, as you give me here: for your whole reaſoning there is built upon the ſame fallacy, with which you begin and end upon this ſubject here; namely, that Idolatrous Worſhip is no more than a mere Speculative Opinion. Your diſtinction of Idolatry into matter of Conſcience and matter of Convenience, has no good foundation, and is of very little uſe. To the objection, that the rights of Conſcience are in their nature ſuch, that they cannot be ſurrendered; and "that no contract to give them up can be bind- "ing;" (an objection, which ſtrongly affects your

[q] View of Bolingbroke's Philoſophy; 3d Edit. p. 187.
[r] Div. Leg. Book v; Sect. 2.

poſition,

poſition, that Idolatry was juſtly puniſhable by the Moſaic Law and by no other, and which merits a good anſwer;) you reply, by affirming it to be "*a* "*plain and deciſive fact*, that none of all the Idola- "trous Worſhip the Jews ever fell into was matter "of Conſcience." You call that *a plain fact*, which is not *a fact*, but a mere empty *ſpeculation*; and ſo far from *plain*, that it is neither at firſt ſight probable, nor in its nature capable of proof: you take upon you peremptorily to *decide* a queſtion, which can be *decided* by no one, but God alone; and your aſſerting, without any authority, "that God fore- "knew that the caſe would not happen," is only one more large ſtride in preſumption. But there is another point, upon which you lay a greater ſtreſs, and which therefore I ſhall examine more particularly. You ſay, "that Civil Society muſt have one "particular, diſtinct, and appropriated end; and "that this end can be no other than ſecurity to the "temporal liberty or property of man;" and 'that 'any attainable good, that it is accidentally capable 'of producing, is not the legitimate buſineſs of 'Civil Society.' Allowing your poſition in its full force, it may indeed follow, that the Civil Magiſtrate is not under an obligation to puniſh every Immorality; but it does by no means follow, that he has not a right to puniſh any but ſuch as are direct breaches of the peace, and infringements of liberty or property: for there are many Immoralities, which, tho' they do not immediately affect liberty or property, yet are inconſiſtent with public decency,

cy, and public order; with the well-being and general good of the State; and therefore puniſhable by the Magiſtrate. This Mr Locke admits; to whoſe authority you refer us [s], for the principle above-mentioned. "The aſſiſtance the Magiſtrate's "authority can give to the true religion, ſays he [t], "is in the ſubduing of *luſts*, in its being directed "againſt *pride*, injuſtice, rapine, *luxury*, and *de*-"*bauchery*, and thoſe other immoralities, which "come properly under his cogniſance, and may be "corrected by puniſhments; and not by the im-"poſing of creeds and ceremonies." Again [u]: "Here then the Magiſtrates aſſiſtance is wanting: "here they may and ought to interpoſe their power, "and by ſeverities againſt *drunkenneſs*, *laſciviouſneſs*, "*and all ſorts of debauchery*; by a ſteady and un-"relaxed puniſhment of all the ways of fraud and "injuſtice; and by their adminiſtration, counte-"nance, and example, reduce *the irregularities of* "*men's manners* into order, and bring *ſobriety*, "peaceableneſs, and induſtry, and honeſty, into "faſhion. This is their proper buſineſs every "where: and for this they have a commiſſion from "God, both by the light of nature and revelation." This interpoſition of the Magiſtrate, for the puniſhment of Immoralities in general, Mr Locke did not think inconſiſtent with what he had before laid down [w]; "that the whole juriſdiction of the Ma-

[s] Div. Leg. Book ii, Sect. 5.
[t] Third Letter on Toleration, p. 329.
[u] Ibid.
[w] Letter concerning Toleration, p. 36.

" giſtrate reaches only to theſe civil concernments," (namely, life, liberty, and property,) " and that " all civil power, right, and dominion is bounded " and confined to the only care of promoting theſe " things." But You perſiſt in urging this general principle, in its utmoſt rigour and without limitation. " The end of the Civil Conſtitution of the " Jews," ſay you, " was the ſame with all other; " namely, ſecurity to men's temporal liberty and " property." Would you infer, that therefore it could not puniſh any immorality, but what was a direct invaſion of liberty or property? Or will you wink ſo hard, as not to ſee immoralities in the old Heathen Idolatry? But, " *the ſupport of morality*," you ſay, " is an adulterate gloſs, to juſtify the ini- " quitous practice of puniſhing for *opinions:*" that is, the power of the Magiſtrate has been, and may be, abuſed; and therefore it ought not to be exerciſed at all.

But with regard to the power of the Magiſtrate, in inforcing ſeveral duties, whether of imperfect or perfect obligation, and correcting the evils that ariſe from the breach of them; and in puniſhing immoralities indirectly affecting either private perſons or the public; in which there is really ſome difficulty from the innate defects of Civil Society: this matter we ſhall be able to clear up much better by having recourſe to the Principles of the *Alliance between Church and State*; of which *Convention*, by the way, though ſo *famous*, I dare ſay, Mr Locke never

ver heard a word; for if he had, he would certainly have had ſomething to ſay to it. Once upon a time then, the Patriarchal Church met the Patriarchal State, by appointment: a ſolemn Congreſs was held, in due form; and, after much adroit negotiation, and no ſmall political refinement, on one ſide and on the other, matters were at laſt adjuſted, and a Treaty of Alliance happily concluded between them. The Original Charter, or Record, of this antient Alliance between the Patriarchal Church and State is laid up in the ſame Archive with that of the later Alliance between the Chriſtian Church and State; of which your Lordſhip has given us the hiſtory at large: and whoever will but take the pains to examine and collate the two Records, will find the latter to be an exact Copy or Counterpart of the former. Now, by the Terms of the Alliance, it appears, that the Church has *a Coactive Power* FOR REFORMATION OF MANNERS. If it be aſked, how the Church came by it; it is anſwered, that the Church received this power or juriſdiction from the State. (See Grants of State to Church; Article III.) The State then was originally poſſeſſed of this Coactive Power for Reformation of Manners, in as full and ample manner as the Church enjoyed it afterwards; or how could the State make a Grant of it to the Church? Certainly. Why then would the State part with it? For ſome people may be inclined to think, that the State might as well have kept it ſtill in her own hands, and never have

have made a Grant of it to the Church at all. Oh, but it is much more fitly placed in the hands of the Church; for when the Church hath prepared the ſubject for its due application and reception, a Coactive Power of the Civil kind, intruſted to the Church, may be applied to good purpoſe; but not till then. How your Lordſhip would apply this Coactive Power to good purpoſe in the preſent ſyſtem of affairs; I leave to you, or whom it may concern, to conſider: be that as it may, the Patriarchal Church being as well provided with the ſame *Coactive Power* FOR REFORMATION OF MANNERS, and having come by it as fairly and honeſtly, by gift or loan from the Patriarchal State; I only propoſe, that the Patriarchal Church ſhould apply it to a very good purpoſe, namely, for her own Preſervation, and for the ſervice of the State, and only ſo far as is abſolutely neceſſary for this purpoſe. I would have no application of fire and faggot; no capital puniſhment; no propagating of eſtabliſhed Religion by force; no impoſing of modes of faith, opinions, or ceremonies; rather the prevention than the puniſhment of crimes, nor even ſo much the Reformation of Manners as the Preſervation of them in their preſent ſtate of purity. In ſhort, I would have her employ her power only in hindering the importation of foreign Immoralities; particularly in excluding a ſpecies of Idolatry, not only highly immoral in itſelf, but moreover attended with a train of the groſſeſt impurities, and the moſt abominable

abominable vices, that ever diſgraced human nature; which, if once admitted, would totally deſtroy the ſaid Patriarchal Church, and ſpread likewiſe a moral corruption through the Patriarchal State; which no Coactive Power whatſoever, in whatever hands it might be placed, would afterwards be able to eradicate.

Before I have done with your Lordſhip's argumentation, in the place [x] above-mentioned; I cannot help remarking, that, while You are pleading for *Toleration*, you treat a Perſon [y] of eminent character and abilities with avowed Contempt, as *a diſſenting preacher*; and while you treat his reaſoning as falſe, fallacious, and abſurd, you give him ample revenge in your own.

Having conſidered the queſtion, in general, of the Patriarchs right of reſtraining the Idolatry of their times; I ſhall take a ſhort view of it with regard to the particular circumſtances attending it in the caſe of the Patriarch Abraham, which was what I more eſpecially inſiſted upon. He came out from his own Idolatrous nation, by the ſpecial call of

[x] Div. Leg. Book v, Sect. 2.

[y] Dr FOSTER; of whom thus Pope:

"Let modeſt Foſter, if he will, excel
"Ten Metropolitans in preaching well."

And thus his Commentator on the place: "This confirms an "obſervation which Mr Hobbes made long ago, That *there be* "*very few Biſhops that act a Sermon ſo well, as divers* PRES-"BYTERIANS *and* FANATIC PREACHERS *can do.* Hiſt. of "Civ. Wars, p. 62. SCRIBL."

God;

God; for this great end of his providence, that he might become the head and father of a nation which was to be kept ſeparate from all others, in order to maintain the pure worſhip of God, in oppoſition to Idolatry then almoſt univerſally prevailing. He ſettled in the Southern parts of Paleſtine, where he was ſurrounded with Idolatrous nations; on one ſide, the Egyptians; on another, the Chaldeans; on a third, and neareſt of all, the Canaanites; of whoſe monſtrous abominations, the concomitants and the effects of their unnatural worſhip, we cannot read without aſtoniſhment: part of his own houſehold perhaps ſtill retaining a tincture of their former ſuperſtitions; and diſpoſed to return, on the firſt opportunity, to their native Religion, from which they might have been unwillingly drawn. We know the ſtrong propenſity to Idolatrous practices, which always poſſeſſed his deſcendants, and which no reſtraints could overcome; his houſehold were now placed in more dangerous circumſtances than his deſcendants ever were afterwards, with fewer checks to reſtrain, or guards to defend them. Temptations of every kind, prejudice, authority, example, faſhion, ſenſual incitements, were ready at hand on every ſide to lay hold on them; and, if left to themſelves, both the general corruption, and particular deluſion of the age, would have born them down, as with a ſtrong tide, to the abyſs, from which they had ſo lately emerged. In theſe circumſtances, would Abraham have fulfilled his engagements with God, would he have performed

the

the peculiar Duty incumbent on him by the charge of the Almighty; which was, "[z] to walk before "him, and to be PERFECT;" and "to command "his children after him, that they ſhould keep the "way of the Lord:" if he had connived at any open attempt to ſet up the worſhip of Falſe Gods among his people? when the leaſt contagion would have run through the whole community; when Idolatry, with all its concomitant abominations, if once permitted, would ſoon have univerſally prevailed; and there would have been but one ſtep between the free Toleration and the perfect Eſtabliſhment of it.

It is agreed among the moſt ſtrenuous Advocates of Religious Liberty, that Toleration has its proper bounds; and that there are opinions, as well as practices, which in a well regulated free State ought not to be tolerated. I ſhall not attempt to define theſe limits; nor indeed do I think it poſſible preciſely to mark the very point, to which the power of the Civil Magiſtrate may in every caſe of this nature be allowed to extend. It has been done in ſome inſtances by Writers of the firſt authority on this ſubject. Mr Locke[a] excludes from the be-

[z] Gen. xvii, 1: xviii, 19. The force of the expreſſion in the former of theſe places, "Be thou perfect," may be illuſtrated by comparing it with Deut. xviii, 13: where, after a charge to the Iſraelites not to learn the abominations of thoſe nations, whom God had caſt out before them, it is immediately added, "Thou ſhalt be PERFECT (or *entire*) with the Lord "thy God."

[a] Letter concerning Toleration, p. 58. &c. 4to.

nefit

nefit of Toleration, all thoſe "who hold opinions "contrary to human ſociety; ſuch as, that Faith "is not to be kept with Heretics, and that Domi-"nion is founded in Grace; thoſe who deliver "themſelves up to the protection and ſervice of "another Prince, by acknowledging a foreign ju-"riſdiction; and who deny the being of a God." To theſe inſtances Biſhop Ellys, in his excellent Tracts on Spiritual Liberty [b], adds, that "thoſe, "who hold errors directly tending to weaken and "ſubvert any civil ſtate; thoſe, who maintain, that "Oaths are unlawful to be taken on any occaſion; "that all, even defenſive, War, and the bearing "any Magiſtracy, are things inconſiſtent with the "duty of a Chriſtian; that ſuch perſons have not, "ſtrictly ſpeaking, any right to Toleration: with "a general exception likewiſe of errors in religion, "which naturally tend to diſturb the Civil State, "and which are hurtful and detrimental to it." I ſhall beg leave to add alſo one or two examples, which I think may juſtly be reckoned of this latter kind: and I hope it will not offend your Lordſhip's moderation, if I exclude from Toleration all thoſe, who make practices ſhocking to humanity, and deſtructive of the human race itſelf, parts of their religious worſhip; ſuch as murders, proſtitutions, and impurities of all kinds; the horrid ſacrifices of Moloch, in which parents offered up their own children, and burnt them alive to appeaſe the Idol; the obſcene rites of Baal-peor, in which the moſt

[b] P. 57, &c.

ſhameleſs

ſhameleſs proſtitutions were permitted and encouraged at leaſt, if not neceſſarily required. Theſe are ſpecimens of the Idolatry, which prevailed, before the time of Moſes, in Canaan [c] and the neighbouring countries; and which I ſuppoſe all Sovereigns and Heads of Tribes, worſhippers of the true God, in thoſe times, did reſtrain, and had a right to reſtrain. I conceive, that their duty to God and to their people demanded of them, that they ſhould oppoſe and hinder the introduction of all ſuch abominations; and ſhould puniſh all thoſe of their dependents, who ſhould attempt to introduce them.

I ſhall conclude this ſubject by propoſing the ſentiments of another celebrated Author upon it, one of known candour and moderation, as well as great judgment, the very learned J. Albertus Fabricius,

[c] Lev. xviii; 21 and 24. Deut. xviii; 10 and 12. Num. xxv: and xxxi; 15, 16. See alſo Deut. xxiii, 17; where קדש, קדשה, properly a holy or conſecrated perſon, one ſeparated to a religious purpoſe, ſignifies a Proſtitute of either ſex: not becauſe Hebrew words have contradictory ſenſes, but becauſe in Canaan and the neighbouring nations, before the time of Moſes, Proſtitution made a part of their Idolatrous Worſhip. If it be ſaid, that there is no particular mention in Job of theſe abominations, but of the worſhip of the Sun and Moon only; I obſerve, that Moſes has in the very ſame manner expreſſed Idolatry in general, by the principal and leading ſpecies of it, the Worſhip of the Sun and Moon, and of the Hoſt of Heaven: and this he has done even in the enacting clauſe of the Law, which inflicts capital puniſhment on the crime of Idolatry. Deut. xvii; 2—5. As to the horrid rite of Human Sacrifices; the Author of *Divine Legation* holds, that it prevailed among the Idolatrous nations both of Chaldea and of Canaan in the time of Abraham. See Div. Leg. Vol. v; p. 252, 253.

Your Lordſhip will be pleaſed to note, that I do not make myſelf anſwerable for the juſtneſs of theſe ſentiments: for I am of opinion, that no general poſitions can well be laid down upon this delicate ſubject, which may not, in their application to particular caſes, be liable to objections. However, this excellent Perſon in his philological work on the Propagation of the Goſpel, having ſet forth the arguments and teſtimonies of antient authors in behalf of Toleration, and given an account of the ſeveral modern writers on the ſubject, adds his own judgment on the limits of Toleration, as follows [d].

" Ne quis autem inferat per hujuſmodi æquani-
" mitatis veluti mollitiem quibuſlibet feneſtram
" aperiri veſanis erroribus, non fovendis modo, ſed
" profitendis etiam palam & propagandis, turban-
" dæque eccleſiæ, & ipſi etiam civili Reip. quieti
" convellendæ: age limites tolerantiæ omnis per
" tria hæcce capita, divinarum literarum ſanæque
" rationis luce præeunte, circumſcribamus.

" I. Everſores religionis omnis, hancque irreli-
" gioſitatem ſuam profeſſos, & aliis ut ſecum ſimi-
" liter inſaniant auctores, non modo licet, ſed de-
" cet & oportet etiam, reprimere, & jubere procul
" eſſe; niſi graviorem animadverſionem etiam in-
" ſolentia ſua ſibi in caput contraxerint. ———

" II. Errorum, quos peſtilentes & ſaluti civium
" ſuorum noxios eſſe Princeps vel Magiſtratus ju-

[d] J. A. Fabricii Lux Salutaris Evangelii toti orbi exoriens; p. 507.

" dicant,

" dicant, diſſeminationem & propagationem in di-
" tione ſua, ne dum ſeditioſa dogmata, impedire,
" ejuſque auctores, poſt admonitionem obſtinatos,
" exilio afficere, & jure poſſunt, & ex officii &
" prudentiæ legibus ſunt obſtricti. Poſſunt jure id
" quidem, cum Patri-familias etiam integrum ſit
" & incumbat omnibus modis impedire, ne ſe in-
" vito doctrina, quam noxiam eſſe non dubitat,
" liberis ſuis aut familiæ inculcetur: officii autem
" hoc ab illis expoſcit ratio, quia non minor Prin-
" cipis & Magiſtratuum in ſubditos, quam boni
" Patris-familias in liberos familiamque amor, non
" minor cura ſalutis debet eſſe: prudentia denique
" idem ab iiſdem requirit, quoniam neglectum
" iſtud in tempore & in ipſis principiis officium
" quantis deinde tumultibus, periculis, & ſæpe
" fortunis ac vita ipſa, vel omnium rerum con-
" verſione, Imperantibus conſtiterit, hiſtoriarum
" monumenta paſſim loquuntur. ———

" III. Si tacere vel emigrare jubeantur qui noxi-
" os errores diſſeminare geſtiunt, non poſſunt illi
" de injuria vel perſecutione conqueri; nam hoc
" ipſo nemo ad religionem contra animi ſententiam
" cogitur." ———

But your Lordſhip, by one parting ſtroke of your pen, has demoliſhed all our reaſoning at once; which proceeded upon a ſuppoſition, that there was really ſuch a thing formerly as Patriarchal Government. You ſet out with aſſerting, that the Patriarchs were not Civil Magiſtrates, becauſe they were

not Kings. I was ſomewhat ſurprized, both at the aſſertion, and the reaſon by which it was ſupported. You now repeat your aſſertion in rather ſtronger terms; you ſay, "they were as much Gods as "Kings." A Petty-Conſtable, conſidered as a perſon in authority, is certainly much more like a King, than like a God: therefore you muſt mean, that the Patriarchs had no authority at all, not even of the loweſt kind; and that Patriarchal Government according to the common ſyſtem, like moſt other common ſyſtems, is all a mere Chimera. You do not vouchſafe to favour us with your reaſons. I ſuppoſe, they may be reſerved for another occaſion. I perceive your Lordſhip has for ſome time born no good will to theſe old Patriarchs; you have determined to allow them "no rights, either rela-"tive to, or connected with, thoſe of a Civil "kind[e]." You are afraid, it ſeems, leſt Sir Robert Filmer's Patriarch, long ſince dead and forgotten, ſhould come again and haunt us; and you think, it would be making ſurer work, to annihilate the perſon himſelf, both body and ſoul, before-hand, than to ſtay to lay the Ghoſt of him, when he may appear. Being under no ſuch apprehenſions myſelf, I ſhall wait with patience, till you ſhall be pleaſed to ſatisfy us. That Idolatry was the ſpecific crime for which Sodom was deſtroyed, and that there never was any ſuch thing as Patriarchal Government, will ſerve as pretty ſubjects to furniſh two new Epi-

[e] View of Bolingbroke's Philoſophy; p. 303.

ſodes

ſodes in *Divine Legation*. Your Lordſhip will eaſily introduce them in any given place, and extend them to any given length, as may be moſt convenient: and I ſuppoſe, we may expect them, when you give us the Firſt Part alſo of *Divine Legation*, a New Edition in Three Volumes.

So much for the principal, and argumentative, part of the Appendix. When I called it Sophiſtry; I paid a compliment to much the greateſt part of it, which it by no means deſerved. Sophiſtry implies addreſs, and management, and artifice; ſomething ſpecious, plauſible, and impoſing; ſome ſemblance, colour, or ſhadow of argument: even to this paltry merit Your argumentation has not the leaſt pretenſions; it is ſuch argumentation, as never was produced by any one *bred up in the principles of* LOGIC.

I proceed in the Second place to the *Buffoonery* of your Lordſhip's Appendix; diſplayed in two curious paragraphs, in which you are diſpoſed to be very witty and ludicrous. The firſt ſets out with a ſort of argumentation, which I do not well know, whether we are to take as meant in earneſt or in jeſt. You amend the Candid Examiner's queſtion by inſerting a new clauſe; and you do it in form, as a matter of great importance, thus: "The Ex-" aminer ſays, *Where was Idolatry ever puniſhed by* " *the Magiſtrate, but under the Jewiſh Œconomy?* A " queſtion equivalent to this;—" Where was Ido-

" latry

" latry punished by the Civil Magistrate *on the esta-*
" *blished Laws of the State*, but in Judea?" I cannot well conceive what the force and intent of this addition, *on the established Laws of the State*, may be; unless you mean to put me to an insuperable difficulty, by challenging me to produce from the Patriarchal Code the enacting clause, and the very words of the Law, by virtue of which Idolatry was to be punished by the Magistrate. Well then, my Lord, to give you all the satisfaction in my power; be pleased to turn to Statut. Noach. cap. iii, in the Patriarchal Statute Book intitled מצות בני נוח, which you may find in the Gemara Babylonica, ad Tit. Sanhedrim, cap. vii, fol. 56. I must note however, that this Chapter, which I quote as Chap. iii, is Chap. i, in some other copies: the Title of it is, על עבודה זרה, *Of strange Worship*, or Idolatry. Indeed, my Lord, the *Præcepta Noachidarum* have been considered by the Learned, not as altogether an idle dream of the Rabbins, but as a subject of some importance; being agreeable to Holy Scripture, and in other respects much better founded than most that are accounted Traditionary doctrines. The very learned Selden has thought it worth while to treat of them at large in a considerable Work[f], of which they make the principal subject: and it is the universal opinion of the Jewish Lawyers of all ages, derived perhaps chiefly from this Tradition, that Idolatry was punished under the Patriarchs.

[f] De Jure Naturali & Gentium, juxta Disciplinam Hebræorum.

And

And they, agreeably to their own Law, make it a Capital Crime. Their deciſion on the point, as expreſſed in the Gemara Babylonica, ibid. is this: " Ob violationem alicujus e ſeptem Præceptis Noachidarum morte afficitur. De unico (ſc. homicidio) aperte effatus eſt Deus ipſe. Atque eadem ratio eſt cunctorum."

You go on in the ſame way; and prove that I " fail in my firſt point, which is, finding out Civil " Magiſtrates" among theſe Patriarchs. Your argument is really a pleaſant one; in proper form it ſtands thus: All Civil Magiſtrates are Kings; but the Patriarchs were not Kings; therefore the Patriarchs were not Civil Magiſtrates. The proof of the Major, I preſume, can be no other than this: All Kings are Civil Magiſtrates; therefore all Civil Magiſtrates are Kings: which, according to the Old Canons of Logic, is what, I think, we uſed to call a *Falſe Converſion.* But, my Lord, though one ſhould grant, that real power neceſſarily depended on nominal title, and was always exactly proportionable to it; will not the title itſelf of *Patriarch* be ſufficient for my purpoſe? Tho' Job and Abraham were not Kings; yet might they not be really and effectually Rulers of Tribes? And tho' the celebrated Mr Shinkin was not King, nor ſo much as Prince of Wales; yet might he not be the Worſhipful Davyth ap Shinkin, Eſq; one of the Juſtices of the Quorum for the County of Montgomery? And yet, if I had at all apprehended it

to

to be neceſſary; I believe, I could have offered ſome proof, that theſe Patriarchs were Kings. As thus: Abraham is called in the Book of Geneſis [g] נשיא אלהים. Now as the HEBREW VERITY, without the Greek Tranſlation of the Seventy, would be at this day, according to your Lordſhip, *a mere arbitrary Cipher*; for Your ſatisfaction, I muſt have recourſe to Them: and they decipher the words thus: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ παρα Θεϑ. So there is at once both Divine Right, and Regal Title. Theſe ſame infallible Greek Tranſlators (I hope they are ſuch, or we are, it ſeems, in a ſad condition with regard to our Bible) have added to the end of the book of Job a note of their own; which moſt of the Fathers, with Origen at their head, held to be a portion of authentic Scripture. Part of it is as follows: Ούτοι οἱ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΣ οἱ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΝΤΕΣ εν Εδωμ, ἡς και αυτος [Ιωϐ] ΗΡΞΕ χωρας· πρωτος Βαλαχ· —— μετα δε Βαλαχ, Ιωϐαϐ ὁ καλϒμενος ΙΩΒ. —— Οἱ δε ελϑοντες προς αυτον φιλοι, ΕΛΙΦΑΖ των Ησαυ ἡων, Θαιμανων ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, Βαλδαδ ὁ Σαυχαιων ΤΥΡΑΝΝΟΣ, Σωφαρ ὁ Μιναιων ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ. And ſo here is for you, my Lord, not only *King Job*, but *King Eliphaz*, *King Bildad*, and *King Zophar* [h]. And what

[g] Chap. xxiii, 6.

[h] Since I wrote the above, I have obſerved that the Author of *Divine Legation* (Vol. v, p. 85.) has caught at this Addition of the Seventy to the book of Job, and preſſed it into his ſervice. "But, what is ſtill of more moment, (ſays he) is a "paragraph at the end of the Septuagint tranſlation of the book "of Job, which makes of theſe three friends, two Kings and

"a

what if I ſhould prove to you ſtill further, that *Job's Wife* was *a Queen?* whether Queen DINAH, as the Jewiſh; or Queen RHAMA, as the Mohammedan Doctors call her; I will not pretend to determine. But ſome of the Fathers [i], as they inſiſt upon Job's being really a King, ſo they mention his Wife, with equal title of dignity, as a Queen. Though your Lordſhip is apt to be a little ſevere upon the Ladies, when they come in your way; yet I am perſuaded, had you been aware of this, you would have treated Her Idumean Majeſty with a little more reſpect [k].

But after all, I neither then was, nor am at preſent, under any ſort of neceſſity of proving theſe Patriarchs to be Kings. I never called them ſo. You think you are mighty witty upon me with King

" a Tyrant." In truth, it may be eaſily of *more moment* than the reſt of the arguments, by which he drives his parallel between the Three Friends of Job, and *Sanballat the Horonite, Tobiah the Servant the Ammonite, and Geſhem the Arabian:* but of what moment it is, or how it is in the leaſt to his purpoſe, I do not ſee. If he means, that the Three Friends, becauſe they were *two Kings* and a *Tyrant*, do therefore more properly repreſent in his Drama two *No-Kings* and a *Slave*; this, I muſt own, is quite above my comprehenſion. Note, that עבד (ὁ δελος, LXX.) may be rendered a *Slave* (in Nehem. ii, 10.) with at leaſt as much propriety, as τυραννος in the other is rendered a *Tyrant*.

[i] Πλανητις και λατρις ἡ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣ δηλουν. Baſil. in Catena Græc. Patr. in Job. collectore Niceta. Lond. 1637, p. 89. Τοσαυτη τις αυτῳ γεγονεν εγκαταλειψις, ὡς και την ΒΑΣΙΛΙΔΑ των αυτου γυναικα θητευειν επι μισθῳ. Olympiodorus, ibid. p. 605.

[k] See Div. Leg. Book vi, Sect. 2.

Melchiſedec, and King Shinkin. On me your jeer *glances aſlope*; but it lights full upon Moſes and St Paul. Your *Monarch, though dropt from the clouds, yet not of the true ſtamp, by hereditary right*; your ludicrous interpretation, of *the Tythes taken from Abraham into fines for Nonconformity*, and the *Bleſſing* into a Spiritual-Court *Abſolution*; your ſneer upon the original Scriptures of the Old Teſtament under the title of the HEBREW VERITY, "the "characteriſtic phraſe with an Ironical Emphaſis, "which is your conſtant formula," when you ſpeak of the Hebrew Scriptures; your inſinuation, that even the ſimple terms [1] uſed in the *Hebrew Verity* are ambiguous

[1] As for his Lordſhip's Wit here upon *Bleſſing* and *Curſing*, let thoſe make any thing of it, that can; I profeſs, it is paſt my comprehenſion: but his Criticiſm I ſhall conſider. "The "Hebrew word to *bleſs* ſignifies likewiſe to *curſe:*" i. e. to curſe, as in a ſolemn execration uttered by a Prieſt; for that is the ſenſe, which his Lordſhip's meaning, if he has any, requires in this place. But he will find no example of the word ברך, in which it can be ſuppoſed to be uſed in that ſenſe; for which the Hebrew, though the moſt barren (as he ſays) of all languages, and though the idea is not of the moſt frequent occurrence, has yet four or five other ſynonymous terms, אלה, ארר, נקב, קבב, קלל. And I will add, that the word ברך never does ſignify to *curſe* at all. The ſeemingly diſcordant ſenſes of this word have been long ago perfectly well reconciled. It ſignifies properly to *bleſs*; or, which was originally the ſame thing, to ſay to a perſon *fare you well*, or *God be with you*. But as we bid *farewell* to a perſon, when we part with him as well with an ill, as with a good, diſpoſition towards him; to bid *farewell* to any one often ſignifies to relinquiſh, and to deſert him, with a deſign of having nothing more to do with him. And this way of ſpeaking, I believe, prevails in all the languages in the world. It will be ſufficient to illuſtrate it by a few examples from

ambiguous and contradictory: all this has nothing to do with me, nor has it the leaſt relation to the ſubject.

from the Latin. " Varro in libris Logiſtoricis dicit, *Ideo* " *mortuis* ſalve *et* vale *dici, non quod* valere *aut* ſalvi eſſe *poſ-* " *ſint, ſed quod ab his recedimus, eos nunquam viſuri.* Hinc " ortum eſt, ut etiam maledicti ſignificationem interdum *va-* " *leat* obtineat; ut Terentius: *valeant, qui inter nos diſcidium* " *volunt:* hoc eſt, ita a nobis recedant, ut nunquam ad noſ- " trum revertantur aſpectum. Ergo cum mortuo dicitur " *vale*, non etymologia conſideranda eſt, ſed conſuetudo; " quod nullis *vale* dicimus niſi a quibus recedimus." Servius ad Virg. Æn. XI, 97. " *Vivitæ Sylvæ.* Valete: non " enim bene optantis eſt, ſed renunciantis." Id. ad Eclog. viii, 58. Thus too, a man may be ſaid to bid *farewell* to God; when he deſerts him, and will ſerve and acknowledge him no longer. " Si maxime talis eſt Deus, ut nulla gratia, " nulla hominum caritate teneatur; *valeat.*" Cicero de Nat. Deor. lib. i. And thus the Poet to his obſcene Deity:

" *Vale*, Priape; debeo tibi nihil:
" Jacebis inter arva ſqualidus ſitu."

TIBULL. iv, 16.

Now ברך can in no other way ſignify *maledictum*, than *vale* does according to the gloſs of Servius; which ſurely is not the proper interpretation of it. Naboth might apoſtatize from God, and throw off his allegiance to the King; and Job's Sons might renounce God ſecretly in their hearts, and Job himſelf openly; without any thing like a *Curſe* implied in any of theſe caſes.

The only place remaining, in which the word has been rendered to *curſe*, is Job ii, 9; which the Author of *Divine Legation* thus explains. " *Curſe God*, BARECH, *benedic, ma-* " *ledic:* here rightly tranſlated *curſe:* —— *and* DIE, that is, " offer violence to yourſelf." I apprehend, not rightly tranſlated in the former part, nor rightly explained in the latter. *Curſe God!* ſhocking and improbable, whatever we may think of Job's Wife. Why not *bleſs God*, in the obvious ſenſe of the word? ומת, *and die*, give up the ghoſt; for to expreſs, *kill yourſelf*, I apprehend, it ought to have been התמותת. " Then ſaid his Wife unto him, Doſt thou ſtill " retain thine integrity? Bleſs God, and die!" That is,

 Thou

ſubject. It is all far-fetched conceit, and forced pleaſantry; void of wit, of meaning, of common decency, of common ſenſe: it is low banter, and illiberal burleſque, upon the Prophet, the Apoſtle, and the Holy Scriptures. 'It is really to be la-'mented [m], when we ſee a Gentleman and a Scho-'lar join the ſmall-dealers in ſecond-hand Ridicule, 'and with affected wit and real profaneneſs, mere-'ly for the ſake of exerting his little talent of 'drollery, treat the Holy Scripture as cavalierly, 'as ever did Collins or Tindal, Lords Shafteſbury 'or Bolingbroke.' But when we ſee You, my

Thou ſeeſt now what recompenſe thou receiveſt for thy virtue and piety, at the hand of God: Go, ſerve God, and periſh for thy pains! To this interpretation Le Clerc (on the place) has aptly applied a paſſage of Ovid, expreſſing the ſame ſentiment much in the ſame manner:

"Vive pius; moriere pius: cole ſacra; colentem
"Mors gravis a templis in cava buſta trahet."

To this Irony Job thus replies: "Thou talkeſt like one of "the fooliſh women," in queſtioning the juſtice of God's diſpenſations. "What, ſhall we receive good at the hand "of God, and ſhall we not receive evil? In all this (adds the Author) Job did not ſin with his lips." In this trial likewiſe, as in the former, Job preſerved his conſtancy and moderation, and expreſſed himſelf rightly and properly with regard to God's juſtice: though in the next trial, that of the provocation of his Friends, charging him with hypocriſy and the greateſt crimes, he did not ſupport himſelf with equal firmneſs of temper, nor keep ſo ſtrict a guard upon his lips. In this ſenſe of the paſſage, Job's reply is a direct anſwer to his Wife's ſpeech: and the whole has a relation to the Queſtion agitated at large in the Poem, Whether good and evil are at preſent diſpenſed by Providence according to the merits and demerits of men; and very properly prepares the way for the great debate on that Queſtion.

[m] See Doctrine of Grace; p. 309.

Lord,

Lord, a Clergyman, and ——————— but I forbear, in regard to your rank and character: it were well, if You had a proper regard to them Yourſelf.

From Buffoonery to Scurrility is an eaſy tranſition; which brings me, Thirdly, to the *Scurrilous* part of your Lordſhip's Appendix.

You are pleaſed to repreſent me as a Zealot and a Bigot, a Propagator of the doctrine of Reſtraint and Perſecution in matters of Religion, and one that has not been bred up in the Principles of Toleration. Pray, my Lord, —— *unde petitum Hoc in me jacis?* You infer it as the conſequence of an argument, which I have occaſionally uſed. Is this a candid, or a fair inference? If, even upon your own principle, that the groſſeſt Act of Idolatrous Worſhip is no more than a mere Speculative Opinion, I had held, that it was nevertheleſs the Duty of the Patriarchs, a Duty ariſing from their peculiar engagements with God, and from their particular ſituation and circumſtances, which I expreſsly inſiſted on, to reſtrain Idolatry; would it fairly be inferred, that I am an enemy to Toleration in general, and by habit and principle of an inquiſitorial and perſecuting ſpirit? Even in this caſe, the inference would have been ungenerous and invidious: but as it is, it ariſes from your own Sophiſtry, and not from my Argument; from which, however you might preſs and torture it for bad conſequences, you might as well have concluded, that I was a Jew,

Jew, or a Mahometan, as an Intolerant and a Perſecutor. Or have you any other reaſons for fixing theſe principles upon me? Have you obſerved any thing in my actions, or converſation, that warrants the imputation? As it happens, I have never omitted any opportunity, that fairly offered itſelf, of bearing my teſtimony againſt theſe very principles; and of expreſſing my abhorence of them, both in private and in public. Tho' I cannot ſuppoſe, that your Lordſhip ever condeſcended to look into what I have publiſhed; except that once you dipped up and down in my Lectures for offenſive paſſages, which you could neither find nor make: yet methinks you might have recollected, what I had written to yourſelf in private. Why then am I branded, as an intolerant Zealot? And *You*, my Lord, is it YOU of all men living, that ſtand forth to accuſe another of Intolerance of Opinions!

But the Abuſe is not merely Perſonal: it goes further; it extends even to the Place of my Education. "But the learned *Profeſſor*, who has been "hardily brought up in the keen Atmoſphere of "WHOLESOME SEVERITIES, and early taught to "diſtinguiſh between *de facto* and *de jure* ——" Pray, my Lord, what is it to the purpoſe, where I have been brought up? You charge me with Principles of Intolerance, adding a gentle inſinuation alſo of Diſaffection to the Preſent Royal Family and Government: you infer theſe Principles, it ſeems, from the Place of my Education. Is this

a

a neceſſary conſequence? Is it even a fair concluſion? May not one have had the good ſenſe, or the good fortune, to have avoided, or to have gotten the better of, the ordinary prejudices of Education? Why then ſhould you think, that I muſt ſtill neceſſarily labour under the bad influence of an Atmoſphere, which I happened to breathe in my youth? If I am not actually chargeable with ſuch Principles now; ſurely it is rather matter of commendation to have eſcaped, or to have ſhaken off, a vice, to which you think I was unhappily expoſed. To have made a proper uſe of the advantages of a good education, is a juſt praiſe; but to have overcome the diſadvantages of a bad one, is a much greater. In ſhort, my Lord, I cannot but think, that this inquiſition concerning my Education is quite beſide the purpoſe. Had I not your Lordſhip's example to juſtify me, I ſhould think it a piece of extreme impertinence to inquire, where YOU were bred; though one might juſtly plead, in excuſe for it, a natural curioſity to know *where* and *how* ſuch a Phenomenon was produced. It is commonly ſaid, that your Lordſhip's Education was of that particular kind, concerning which it is a remark of that great judge of men and manners, Lord CLARENDON, (on whom You have therefore with a wonderful happineſs of alluſion, juſtneſs of application, and elegance of expreſſion, conferred "the unrivaled title[n] of *the Chancellor of Human*

[n] A Critical and Philoſophical Enquiry into the Cauſes of Prodigies and Miracles, as related by Hiſtorians; p. 61.

"*Nature*,")

" *Nature,*") that it peculiarly diſpoſes men to be Proud, Inſolent, and Pragmatical °. Now, my Lord, as You have in your whole behaviour, and in all your writings, remarkably diſtinguiſhed yourſelf by your humility, lenity, meekneſs, forbearance, candour, humanity, civility, decency, good manners, good temper, moderation with regard to the opinions of others, and a modeſt diffidence of your own; this unpromiſing circumſtance of your Education is ſo far from being a diſgrace to You, that it highly redounds to your praiſe.

But, I am wholly precluded from all claim to ſuch merit: on the contrary, it is well for me, if I can acquit myſelf of a charge that lies hard upon me; the burthen of being reſponſible for the great advantages, which I enjoyed. For, my Lord, I was educated in THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. I enjoyed all the advantages both public and private, which that famous Seat of Learning ſo largely affords. I ſpent many happy years in that Illuſtrious Society, in a well-regulated courſe of uſeful diſcipline and ſtudies, and in the agreeable and improving commerce of Gentlemen and of Scholars:

° " Colonel Harriſon was the ſon of a butcher near Nant-
" wich in Cheſhire, and had been bred up in the place of a
" Clerk under a Lawyer of good account in thoſe parts; which
" kind of Education introduces men into the language and
" practice of buſineſs; and, if it be not reſiſted by the great
" ingenuity of the perſon, inclines young men to more Pride,
" than any other kind of breeding; and diſpoſes them to be
" Pragmatical and Inſolent." Clarendon's Hiſtory; Vol. iii, p. 246: 8vo.

in

in a Society, where emulation without envy, ambition without jealouſy, contention without animoſity, incited induſtry, and awakened genius; where a liberal purſuit of knowledge, and a generous freedom of thought, was raiſed, encouraged, and puſhed forward, by example, by commendation, and by authority. I breathed the ſame Atmoſphere, that the HOOKERS, the CHILLINGWORTHS, and the LOCKES, had breathed before: whoſe benevolence and humanity were as extenſive as their vaſt genius and their comprehenſive knowledge; who always treated their adverſaries with civility and reſpect; who made candour, moderation, and liberal judgment, as much the rule and law, as the ſubject of their diſcourſe; who did not amuſe their Readers with empty declamations and fine-ſpun theories of Toleration, while they were themſelves agitated with a furious Inquiſitorial ſpirit, ſeizing every one they could lay hold on, for preſuming to diſſent from them in matters the moſt indifferent, and dragging them through the fiery Ordeal of abuſive Controverſy. And do you reproach me with my education in This Place, and with my relation to This moſt reſpectable Body; which I ſhall always eſteem my greateſt advantage, and my higheſt honour?

This, my Lord, could not be your deſign. The ſtroke was not principally aimed at me; your deſign was, by a far-fetched conceit, to ſtrike through me at The Univerſity of OXFORD; and to reflect on that eminent Seat of Learning, as a Nurſery of bigotry, intolerance, perſecution, and diſ-

loyalty. I ſhall not trouble myſelf to inquire into the grounds and reaſons, which you may pretend for this " iniquitous and ſcurrilous Reflection on " ſo illuſtrious a Body :" the real motives of *your* Panegyric and Satire are not to be ſought in the merits or demerits of the particular ſubjects of them; but in times, circumſtances, and private hiſtory; by which, it is well known, they are conſtantly regulated, and with which they always vary.

You ſet out with favourable thoughts and high notions of the Univerſity of Oxford: and in one of your firſt literary performances, at a time when your panegyric was not certainly better applied than it might have been now, you no ſooner touched upon the ſubject, than you took fire at the bright idea: rapt in the ſpirit of prophetic enthuſiaſm, your *Muſa Pedeſtris* immediately got on horſeback, and mounted on her Pegaſus away ſhe went in this high prancing ſtyle, " majorque videri

" Nec mortale ſonans :"

" Methinks I ſee her, like the mighty Eagle,
" renewing her *immortal Youth*, and purging
" her opening Sight at th' unobſtructed Beams
" of our benign Meridian SUN; which ſome
" pretend to ſay had been dazled and abuſed
" by an inglorious peſtilential METEOR;
" while th' ill-affected Birds of Night would with [their envious Hootings,
" prognoſticate a Length of Darkneſs and Decay [P]."

[P] Prodigies and Miracles; p. 136.

" And

" And what a deal of candid curteſy,
" ('Twas ere his infant fortune came to age,)
" Did then this " ——————

Did You, my Lord, I would ſay,—" proffer us" in your Preface to the Second Volume of *Divine Legation?* Then it was: " Here SCIENCE and " TRUE RELIGION firſt ſtarted from their long " ſlumber of ſix barbarous ages. ——— And ani- " mated with their former ſucceſſes over IGNO- " RANCE and SUPERSTITION, they now turn their " arms with unimpared vigour againſt VICE and " PROFANENESS." Then, " we juſtly regarded " them, as the laſt ſupports of a corrupt declining " Age." And more ſtill, in the ſame ſugared ſtyle: " The only ſymptom not mortal in our " ſickneſs is, that we have not yet *abuſed* our Phy- " ſician. Amidſt that unbridled licence, which " now inſults every thing in *Government* and *Reli-* " *gion*, it is ſome Conſolation to every good man " to ſee the Two Univerſities ſecure from *Out-* *rage.*" Alas! my Lord, the times are now ſadly changed, when theſe ſymptoms of a mortal diſ- eaſe break out in the vital parts; and this very *Abuſe* and *Outrage*, violating " the ſacred Reve- " rence of the Areopagus, which the moſt ungo- " verned Tongue never dared to violate " before, comes from a quarter, whence it might leaſt have been feared; from One of that Order, which theſe Seminaries of Learning and Religion have always looked upon as their chief glory, and their ſureſt protection.

In the Second Edition of this Preface, the clauſe laſt cited came forth attended with a curious Note. ‘ The Author of the *Weekly Miſcellany* had even ‘ then begun this very *Outrage*;’ and had reflected upon the Univerſity of Oxford, “ for letting the “ Methodiſts alone, and permitting them to take “ Degrees; which was giving them encourage- “ ment.” What now could one ſuppoſe ſo proper, or what ſo obvious, for our profeſt Panegyriſt of the Univerſity of Oxford, and ſtrenuous Advocate for Toleration, to do in this caſe, as to turn this abſurd reproach upon the Univerſity to her praiſe? No ſuch thing. He is really ſcandalized at it, and treats it as an “ iniquitous and ſcurrilous Reflec- “ tion on ſo illuſtrious a Body:” he ſets himſelf to work in good earneſt, and endeavours with all his might to wipe off the odious and unjuſt aſperſion, and to defend them againſt this grievous charge of Moderation and Tolerance. “ The Ma- “ giſtrates of the Place *did* uſe all lawful means to “ ſuppreſs them.” The Laws had unhappily tied up their hands, ſo that they could not have employed fire and fagot, if they had been ever ſo well inclined; and how much ſoever the Zealots might have wiſhed it: all the defence therefore their Apologiſt could make was, ‘ that the worthy ‘ Vice-Chancellor went and reprimanded Mr Whit- ‘ field before a large Congregation, which he had ‘ gathered together about him, and obliged him ‘ that very day to leave the Town, where he has

‘ not

'not been heard of ſince.' A poor Apology at beſt! *Only Baniſhment*, inflicted by the private authority of the worthy Vice-Chancellor; and the *Illuſtrious Body* had no concern in it at all, nor any claim of merit from this laudable exertion of WHOLESOME SEVERITY.

But here, alas! at this period, end all the glories of the Two Univerſities. Something was at this time depending at Oxford [q]; certain favours were ſolicited; Academical Honours, out of the ordinary courſe, were expected. And how theſe expectations ſucceeded, may be ſeen in a ſubſequent edition of the Preface; where all theſe lofty ſtrains of Panegyric are eraſed and cancelled for ever.

Ex illo fluere, ac retro ſublapſa referri,
Res Danaûm! ————

Academical Degrees, ſo lately the object of Ambition, ſoon degenerated into Profeſſorſhips "of the "*Occult Sciences*[r];" "the Scene of Letters[s] was "cloſed, and every Science was retiring from its "*Profeſſors* to Dictionary-makers and Bookſellers;" and the Univerſity of Oxford, whoſe Moderation and Forbearance of late was ſuch, as to put a zealous Apologiſt to great difficulties in clearing her of the ſcandalous imputation, is now arrived at the

[q] See Pope's Letters to Warburton; Letters cviii, cix, and cxiv.

[r] Warburton's Preface to Shakeſpear; p. xxvi.

[s] Warburton's Remarks on Occaſional Reflections; Part II. p. 155. See alſo Note to Dunciad; Book iv. ver. 241.

contrary

contrary extreme, and is become to the ſame perſon a proper ſubject of invective, as the Nurſing Mother of Bigotry and Perſecution!

But, my Lord, though the Univerſity of Oxford, incapable of eſtimating Merit of ſuch uncommon ſize, may have treated you with an ill-judged diſregard, and unjuſtly witheld thoſe honours which You thought your due; yet why ſhould your Lordſhip take ſuch a diſappointment ſo much to heart, and hoard it up ſo long in your reſentment? Surely You have philoſophy enough, to conſole yourſelf upon this, and much greater occaſions. What if one, as mean as I am, ſhould have born away honours, which You ſolicited in vain? What if Another, worthy indeed in all reſpects, unleſs compared with You, (and who can abide ſuch a compariſon?) ſhould have been lately honoured with a Promotion, which You ought to have adorned? Your wiſdom, Your experience, Your knowledge of the world and of yourſelf, ſhould eaſily reconcile all this, and much more than this, to Your perfect acquieſcence. Conſcious as You are of Your own ſuperlative worth, You ſhould rather conſider theſe events on the favourable ſide; as a preſumptive proof of Your great eminence; as a kind of public atteſtation of thoſe tranſcendent talents, which uſually depreſs their envied poſſeſſor: You, who ſo well know, that "we often ſee thoſe "Honours conferred upon MEDIOCRITY, which "are due to SUPERIOR MERIT;" and that "it "is

" is a Fact confirmed by the univerſal experience " of all ages and nations, that the MOST WORTH- " LESS generally gets the PRIZE."

Having gone through the Sophiſtry, the Buffoonery, and the Scurrility, of the Appendix; I come now, laſtly, to the *Critical* part of it, which we ſhall find to be of a character ſomewhat different.

In the firſt place, I ſhall juſt make a ſmall remark or two upon your Lordſhip's Tranſlation of my words. The peculiar character of the Poem of Job is " a certain primitive and *noble ſimplicity*." I beg your pardon, my Lord: I ſaid not a word of *a noble ſimplicity*; nor was it at all to my purpoſe. I ſaid, its peculiar character was αρχαϊσμος, an air or caſt of Antiquity; which a Poem may have, without being either *noble* or *ſimple*: as, for inſtance, one of old Chaucer's merry Tales; and the Poem of Job had the ſame *noble ſimplicity*, which it has now, the very firſt day after it was written, when it had no air of Antiquity at all. " Non " multo ſanius judicare," " to judge almoſt as " *inſanely*." Surely, my Lord, a very *inſane* tranſlation. I appeal to any indifferent judge, whether it gives the obvious and uſual meaning [t] of the phraſe,

[t] " Euctemon dixit —— *ſanius* quam Glycon." Seneca, Controv. xxxiv. " Aſiatici oratores non contemnendi; —— " Rhodii *ſaniores*." Cicero, de Clar. Orat. 13. In each of theſe inſtances, both are commended; the one as more *judicious* than the other.

phraſe, when employed in a ſubject of Criticiſm: and I ſolemnly proteſt, that the idea, which your tranſlation gives, never entered into my thoughts. You pretend, that by virtue of this phraſe I have repreſented you as *mad-brained*. My Lord, you may take the epithet to yourſelf, if you pleaſe; it is of your own application: I have nothing to do with it, and ſhall not diſpute the propriety of it with you. But it is my misfortune, that I cannot make myſelf underſtood in Latin by your Lordſhip, and ſome of your Friends. The Candid Examiner would needs have it, that the proper Engliſh of *Animorum Immortalium deſcriptio* was, *a deſcription of future rewards and puniſhments, or an account of the ſtate and condition of good and bad men after death* [u]; though the phraſe was at large explained in the very place [w] by the words "notio & intelligentia, unde, "ubi & quales eſſent, explicarent; —— quis eo-"rum locus, forma, conditio." And your Lordſhip ſurpriſingly fell in with your Friend's interpretation. But your Candid Friend, who has a great talent at deducing conſequences, and in this reſpect is indeed (as you always ſtyle him) an Excellent Writer, upon this poſtulatum went on for ſeven pages imputing to me opinions, ſuppoſitions, *invidious* expreſſions, and *profligate* inſinuations; not one of which ever entered into my conception.

[u] See Free and Candid Examination, &c. p. 279.

[w] De Sacra Poeſi Hebræorum, Præl. vii.

Your

Your Lordſhip begins your Critical remarks with obſerving, ‘ that I am a little unlucky in my com-‘ pariſon ;’ that is, in comparing the judgment of thoſe who place the Poem of Job below the Babylonian Captivity, with that of Father Harduin, who aſcribed the golden Poems of Virgil, Horace, and the reſt, to the iron ages of the Monks. Now really I thought, I had been particularly lucky in this compariſon ; when, a year or two after I had written this Note, and before this Note was publiſhed, I found that a very Learned and Ingenious foreign Profeſſor had hit upon the very ſame Compariſon, in very nearly the ſame caſe[x] ; and that the Compariſon had ſtruck him ſo forcibly, that he could not forbear uſing it a ſecond time. A Parallel not common, nor, I believe, ever before applied to this ſubject, occurring at once to two different Perſons, between whom there was then no communication whatever, ſhould ſeem from this very circumſtance to have a juſt foundation.

x “ Nihil Ezra inornatius ; ut mirer, quo erroris portento “ Moſaica illi ſcripta tribui potuerint : quamquam non eſt, “ quod mirer, cum facinus ſimillimum auſus ſit Harduinus.” Michaelis Præfat. in Not. in Prælect. De Sacra Poeſi Hebræorum ; p. ix.

“ Ezræ certe, cujus Hebraiſmo nihil eſt humilius & ingratius, “ Pſalmos nobiliſſimos tribuere, peccato vicinum eſt Harduini, “ odas Horatianas infimæ linguæ Latinæ ætati tribuenti.” Michaelis Notæ ; p. 106.

“ Hocne poema [Jobi] *aureum* ubique linguæ Hebraicæ, & “ Moſaicam ætatem ſpirans, ad *ferrea* illa tempora detruda-“ mus ; quæ, extincto uno bono poeta, Jeremia, nihil perfecti, “ ac ne quidem mediocriter pulcri, fuderunt ? ” Ibid. p. 188. Edit. Oxon.

But, as to the Juſtneſs of the Compariſon; we ſhall ſee by and by, whether it does not appear from a true ſtate of the things themſelves ſo compared. " The age of Job, ſay you, as fixed by " him, (the Profeſſor,) and the age of the Writer " of his hiſtory, as fixed by me, run exactly pa- " rallel, not with the times of Virgil and Frederic " Barbaroſſa, as he would inſinuate, but with thoſe " of Ennius and Virgil." I am afraid, it will at laſt appear; that, after all the Adventures of the Divine Legation of Moſes, " Judea itſelf is a *terra* " *incognita* to this great Adventurer." Ezra the Virgil of the Hebrew Claſſics! and Ezra to Job, in grace, elegance, and purity of language, as Virgil to Ennius! I will venture to affirm, that the Critic, who gives forth this as his deciſive judgment, never read either Job or Ezra: I mean, in the original, and with a competent knowledge of the language. I was very well convinced before, that the only Interpreter, who has made the Book of Job intelligible [y], had never read Job in Hebrew; and I now ſuſpect, that the Demonſtrator of the Divine Legation of Moſes never read the Hebrew Pentateuch. ——— " Job, the hero of the " Poem, lived in an *age* when civil Society was but " beginning to ſhew itſelf, and what is more, in a " *country* where it never yet was formed." I ſuppoſe the age of Job to have been earlier than that of Moſes; and the country of Job to have been

[y] See Div. Leg. Vol. v, p. 125.

the

the land of Edom, part of Arabia Petræa. I have given my reaſons [z] for making Job an Idumean; and I now obſerve, that the great Sir Iſaac Newton [a] was of the ſame opinion. The Country of Job was upon the borders of Egypt; and the Age of Job was when the Empire of Egypt was arrived at a high degree of improvement in all the arts of civil Society. The Country of Job muſt have had a conſiderable communication with Egypt, by means of the great commerce, which was carried on between all the Eaſtern countries and Egypt [b], great part of which muſt paſs through Edom; and it was a Country of celebrated reputation for *wiſdom* [c], for "authors of fables, and ſearchers "out of underſtanding;" a reputation probably derived from antient times. ——— "But Ezra "was an eminent Citizen in the moſt perfect civil "government in the world." In a civil government, your Lordſhip ought to have ſaid, which had lain a long time in a ſtate of diſſolution, and was but juſt now riſing out of its ruins: circumſtances, which allow no encouragement or opportunity for the cultivation of Letters. —— "Which "he was ſent home to reſtore, laden with the lite-"rary treaſures of the Eaſt." Ezra was indeed ſent home laden with treaſures; with [d] ſix hundred and fifty talents of ſilver, and an hundred talents

[z] De Sacra Poeſi Hebræorum; Præl. xxxii. Not. 1.
[a] Chronology; p. 213. [b] Gen. xxxvii; 25, 28.
[c] Jer. xlix, 7: Obad. 8: Baruch iii, 23.
[d] Ezra viii; 26, 27: and vii, 22.

of gold; and with baſons, and other veſſels of gold, and ſilver, and fine copper; and with good ſtore of wheat, and wine, and oil, and ſalt: but as for the Literary treaſures of the Eaſt, with which he was ſent home laden, I have never read of them in Hiſtory, nor can I find any traces of them in his Writings. —— "From this ſecond tranſplantation "of the Republic, Science got footing in Judea:" in a low degree, if we may judge by the few monuments that remain of it; nor did it ever make any near approach to the ſtate in which it had been for many ages before the Captivity. —— "And, "from a ſtrict *adherence* to the LAW, a ſtudious "cultivation of the LANGUAGE, in which that "Law was written, naturally followed." If the Hebrew Language was brought home ſafe and ſound, and in vulgar uſe, as your Lordſhip ſuppoſes, from the Seventy years Captivity at Babylon, which is very improbable; how came it, in the midſt of this ſtudious cultivation of it, to ſlip through their fingers, and be loſt as a living Language, as it certainly was within a few generations afterwards? —— "As it did amongſt the Sara-"zens, who cultivated the Arabic, on the ſame "principle. And to underſtand how great this "was in both, we need only conſider, that each "had the ſame averſion to a tranſlation of their "Law into a foreign language." Beſides that the conſequence is not very clear, part of the premiſes is certainly falſe: for that the Jews, before Chriſtianity began to prevail, had no averſion to a tranſ-

lation

lation of their Law into a foreign Language, is plain, from the Greek Tranſlation of the Seventy, and from the Chaldee Paraphraſes; all made by the Jews themſelves, and publicly uſed by them in their Synagogues: in memory of the firſt of which the Alexandrine Jews long kept an annual feaſt, in the Iſle of Pharos*; till, the Chriſtians making uſe of that Tranſlation againſt them, they began to deteſt it, and, as ſome ſay, changed their feaſt into a faſt. What the Saracens did with the Arabic, I know not; and here your Lordſhip getting out of my depth, I muſt leave you to diſcuſs this point of Oriental Learning by yourſelf; for I do not chooſe to talk learnedly about what I do not underſtand. —— "Yet for all this, the Profeſſor calls Ezra a "SEMI-BARBARIAN." My Lord, you miſtake me: you will perpetually appropriate to yourſelf in particular, what I ſay in general; as if You always intirely poſſeſſed my thoughts, and no one elſe was worth regarding. I did not confine myſelf to Your hypotheſis: I was ſpeaking of thoſe Authors in general, who place the Book of Job below the Babyloniſh Captivity. I call the *Age* Semi-barbarous, if you pleaſe: I do not call Ezra *a Semi-barbarous Poet*; for I maintain, that Ezra was no Poet at all. Others have placed the Book of Job below the Captivity, as well as You; Le Clerc, for inſtance: but Le Clerc underſtood what he was about too well to make Ezra the Author of the Poem; for

* Philo, De Vita Moſis; Lib. ii. See Simon, Hiſtoire Critique du V. T. Liv. i, chap. 17.

he

he muſt have known, that Ezra was as improper a perſon as could well be choſen for that purpoſe.

But granting, that in calling the *Age* Semi-barbarous, I virtually call Ezra ſo, who belonged to it. Well then; " the Profeſſor calls Ezra a SE-" MI-BARBARIAN, THO' we agree, that he wrote " by the Inſpiration of the Moſt High." So, it ſeems, the character of *Semi-barbarian* is incompatible with that of an Inſpired Writer; and the invidious concluſion is, that by calling Ezra a Semibarbarian, I caſt a reflection upon him, that tends to invalidate the opinion of his Inſpiration. Manifeſtly ſo: the oppoſition is ſtrongly marked; Ezra a *Semi-barbarian*, THO' *Inſpired!* Now, my Lord, pray recollect your own poſition concerning this matter in the *Doctrine of Grace:* by which it ſhould rather ſeem, that I had been faulty quite on the other ſide, and that by calling Ezra only half a Barbarian, I had robbed him of half his pretenſions to the Inſpiration of the Moſt High. Here follows your poſition: you introduce it as a bold one, and it fully comes up to the character you give of it. " I will be *bold* to affirm[f], that were the " STYLE of the New Teſtament exactly ſuch as " his (Dr Middleton's) very exaggerated account

[f] *Doctrine of Grace*; p. 55. See this bold Paradox, and the principles on which it is raiſed, effectually confuted by the Learned and Ingenious Dr *Thomas Leland*, of Trinity College, Dublin, in a *Diſſertation on the Principles of Eloquence*; and the Confutation unanſwerably ſupported againſt an Anonymous Critic, in his *Examination of the Criticiſm on the Diſſertation*.

" of

" of it would perſuade us to believe, namely, that " it *is utterly rude and barbarous, and abounding with* " *every fault that can poſſibly deform a language*, this " is ſo far from proving ſuch language not divine- " ly inſpired, that it is one *certain mark* of this " original." And can You now, conſiſtently with this bold affirmation, upbraid me with the crime of calling an Inſpired Writer a Semi-barbarian? Commend me to the candid and judicious Polemic; who, reſolved at all adventures to object, and being at a loſs for other objections, caſts his own Principles, as a ſevere reproach, in the teeth of his adverſary.

I proceed to your Lordſhip's obſervations upon the internal argument from TASTE; only premiſing, that I would beg your Readers to note, that the delicate image of " diſtinguiſhing Partridge " from Horſe-fleſh," is intirely your own; though you do me the honour of it by marking it as mine: and that I have conſulted the place of *Divine Legation* here referred to; where you make the excellencies of the ſtyle of Job parallel to " the beauty " and weight of Ennius's elegance[g]; " which only ſhews, that you are very little acquainted with the Style of Job: and afterwards illuſtrate the excellencies of Job's language, as of the ſame kind with thoſe of " the languages of certain Warrior- " tribes of North America; " which is *ignotum per*

[g] Vol. v, p. 44.

ignotius.

ignotius. The ſtyle of Job, as I conceive, is very improperly made parallel to that of Ennius. Job is rather the Homer of the Hebrew Claſſics; who, with the venerable air of antiquity, and the force and ſpirit of original genius, has, at the ſame time, that elegance of language and beauty of compoſition, which the more poliſhed and refined ages never ſurpaſſed.

Having propoſed to conſider the argument from Taſte, your Lordſhip ſeems to me to ſet out with ſome embarraſment; for you immediately confound Taſte with Science, which ſurely are two very diſtinct things. A man may have a vaſt deal of Knowledge, or what is commonly called Learning; and yet have no good Taſte at all. And here, more opportunely for the illuſtration of what I am ſaying, than for your own purpoſe, you introduce "the incomparable BENTLEY, as ſtanding in the "foremoſt rank of modern Critics:" of Grammatical and Verbal Critics, I agree with you. He could judge, with great penetration, of the age of an Author, by the dialect, the phraſe, and the matter; by Thericlean cups, and Sicilian talents: this was his proper ſphere of Science, and in this he excelled. But in matters of pure Taſte, a fine diſcernment of the different characters of compoſition, colours of ſtyle, and manners of thinking, of the interior beauties and excellencies of writing; in regard to all this, what was he? *Unus caprimulgus aut foſſor.* What then has he to do here?

You

You propoſed to conſider the point before us, as an argument from Taſte; not as a queſtion merely of Verbal and Grammatical Criticiſm. However, as You lead the way, I ſhall endeavour to follow you.

Your Lordſhip denies then, that there is any foundation for forming even a tolerable judgment, concerning the time of any one of the writers of the Old Teſtament from his ſtyle and manner; and you treat all ſuch judgment as affected and pedantic. The reaſons which you give for this deciſion are, the preſent condition of the Hebrew language being "the narroweſt of all languages;" and the nature of the Hebrew language in itſelf, being "the moſt barren of all languages;" and moreover, being a language "little ſubject to change, "both from the common genius of the Eaſt, "and the peculiar circumſtances of a ſequeſtered "people."

This laſt reaſon will be eaſily removed out of the way, by juſt obſerving, that it is very improperly urged in the preſent queſtion; which is not concerning a difference of language between writers of diſtant periods, in the flouriſhing times of the Republic; but between writers, before and after the Captivity of Babylon: a revolution, by which this ſequeſtered people were removed from their own to a foreign country, and continued for a long time mixed with foreigners; which greatly corrupted at leaſt, if it did not wholly deſtroy,

their antient language: ſo that notwithſtanding the common genius of the Eaſt, little ſubject to change, here is foundation enough for ſuppoſing a very diſcernible difference of language, in writers ſo differently circumſtanced in this reſpect.

Of the Hebrew Language in its preſent condition "the only remains, you ſay, are contained in "ONE SMALL Volume." So your Lordſhip has at once reduced the whole Hebrew Bible to the compaſs of a nut-ſhell. I think, you might have ſaid more properly Twenty Four Volumes, (according to the antient diviſion of the Jews) if they muſt be SMALL ones. Now, my Lord, give me leave to ſet this matter in another light; or rather, leſt you ſhould ſay I miſrepreſent it, you ſhall do it yourſelf. "The Bible[h] contains a very circum-"ſtantial account of this People, from the time "of Moſes to the great Captivity; not only the "hiſtory of public occurrences, but the lives of "private perſons of both ſexes, and of all ages, "conditions, characters and complexions; in the "adventures of virgins, matrons, kings, ſoldiers, "ſcholars, parents, merchants, huſbandmen. They "are given too in every circumſtance of life; cap-"tive, victorious, in ſickneſs and in health; in "full ſecurity and amidſt impending dangers; "plunged in civil buſineſs, or retired and ſequeſt-"ered in the ſervice of Religion. Together with "their ſtory, we have their compoſitions likewiſe:

[h] Div. Leg. Vol. v, p. 395.

"in

" in one place we hear their triumphal; in another, " their penitential ſtrains. Here we have their ex- " ultations for bleſſings received; there, their de- " precations of evil apprehended: here they urge " their moral precepts to their contemporaries; " and there again, they treaſure up their Prophe- " cies and Predictions for the uſe of poſterity; " and on each, denounce the threatenings and pro- " miſes of Heaven." Now all theſe Writings, containing ſo many various matters, treated of by various authors, in verſe and in proſe, of different kinds, and in different manners of compoſition; or (to keep ſtill to your own terms) " this LARGE " and Miſcellaneous Volume [i]," one would think ſhould have preſerved ſo much of the language, as would afford proper and ſufficient materials to work upon: ſo that, with the addition of many other helps, one might attain to a competent knowledge of it, and be able to form a tolerable judgment of the different Styles of the ſeveral Writers. You quote an author, who ſays of the Hebrew Language, as contained in the Old Teſtament, " non " ſuppeditat omnes dictiones loquendi neceſſarias." No more does the Latin Tongue, as contained in the Claſſics. If Solomon's Botanical writings had been preſerved; they would have added conſiderably to our ſtock of Hebrew, and have been of great ſervice in clearing up many particular paſſages, which are now very obſcure: but I do not think,

[i] Divine Legation; Vol. iv, p. 349: note.

they would have helped us much in acquiring a clearer idea of the peculiar ſtyle and manner of compoſition of the ſeveral Authors of the Old Teſtament. Again: if Vitruvius, and the Elder Pliny; and the Authors De Re Ruſtica, had been loſt; our ſtock of Latin would have been much leſſened; and ſome few paſſages in ſome authors remaining might have been rendered very obſcure, and perhaps unintelligible: and yet I believe, we ſhould have been able full as well to have judged of the difference between Salluſt and Eutropius, and between Horace and Auſonius, as to their peculiar ſtyle and manner of compoſition, as we do now.

And as to the Nature of the language in itſelf, which you ſay is the moſt barren of all languages: I take this to be a charge, which you cannot prove. What, did the Hebrew Writers then want words and phraſes, to expreſs properly and fully the ſubjects of which they treated? Far from it. I think, there might be produced from them examples of Amplification, ſet off with as great Copiouſneſs of expreſſion, as from almoſt any Authors whatever. And, in ſeveral inſtances, there are in Hebrew[k] as many ſynonymous terms and phraſes to expreſs the ſame ideas, as perhaps can be produced, in a like number of inſtances taken at pleaſure, even in the Greek language itſelf.

Your Lordſhip enters further into this ſubject in another place; which I ſhall therefore conſider.

[k] See Carpzovii Critica Sacra; Par. I, Cap. v, Sect. 4.

"*Amant*

" *Amant Hebræi,*" ſays Grotius, as you quote him[1], " *verborum copiam*; *itaque rem eandem multis verbis* " *exprimunt.* He does not tell us the reaſon:" but your Lordſhip is ſo good as to ſupply it. " It " ariſes from the narrowneſs of the Hebrew lan- " guage, which is the ſcantieſt of all the learned " languages of the Eaſt: for when the ſpeaker's " phraſe comes not up to his ideas (as in a ſcanty " language it often will not) he naturally endea- " vours to explain himſelf by a repetition of the " thought in other words; as he whoſe body is " ſtraitened in room is never relieved but by a con- " tinual change of poſture." A reaſon ſo very refined, that I much ſuſpect it has no good foundation. " The Hebrews are fond of a copiouſneſs " of words; and therefore expreſs the ſame thing " in many words:" or, as you very rightly explain it, " by a repetition of the ſame thought in " other words." Now I think, they would never have been able to ſatisfy this their fondneſs for a copiouſneſs of words, by repeating the ſame thought in other words; unleſs they had had at command different words, to expreſs the ſame thought in: that is, unleſs their language had been copious, and had abounded in ſynonymous or parallel expreſſions. For example: the general ſubject of the CXIX^th^ Pſalm is the Bleſſedneſs of Keeping the Law; which is purſued through Twenty Two Alphabetical Stanzas, of Eight Diſtichs each, with

[1] Divine Legation; Book iv, Sect. 4.

much

much ſameneſs of thought, but great variety of expreſſion. Inſtead of twelve or fourteen ſynonymous terms to expreſs the Law, and at leaſt four times as many parallel phraſes to expreſs the Keeping of it; if you reduce the Pſalmiſt to a ſingle term or two, you ſtrike him dumb: be he ever ſo fond of Pleonaſm, and ever ſo eager to expreſs himſelf copiouſly, he will neither be able to attain, nor ſo much as to teſtify his deſire, unleſs you give him his free range in the natural copiouſneſs of his language. Can it then poſſibly be aſcribed to the Narrowneſs of his language, that the Pſalmiſt repeats his thought ſo often in other words? to his inability, and at the ſame time his eagerneſs, to expreſs himſelf to his ſatisfaction, that he ſo often changes his poſture? On the contrary; do we not evidently ſee, that he ſets out with a formed deſign of amplifying his ſubject to a ſurpriſing extent, upon a plan, that neceſſarily required a Hundred and Seventy Six Diſtichs, upon almoſt the ſame thought, and in confidence of an ample ſtock of words and phraſes to carry him through it? This manner of repeating the ſame thing in ſynonymous or parallel terms prevails throughout the Hebrew Poetry; and is a principal Characteriſtic of the Poetical Style. The Character of the Poetical Style in general muſt ariſe from the Nature of the langage; and the Pleonaſtic Character in particular muſt ariſe from the Abundance of parallel terms and phraſes in the language. You conclude your reaſoning thus: "the moſt ſcanty language there-

"fore

" fore will be always fulleſt of repetitions;" that is, " of repetitions of the ſame thought in other " words[m]." This I take to be little better than a contradiction in terms: for a language, that abounds in ſuch repetitions, for that very reaſon cannot be ſcanty; and the Pleonaſtic Character of the Hebrew language, which You ſay aroſe from its being the moſt Scanty of all languages, is on the contrary a demonſtration, that it was in a conſiderable degree Copious.

Indeed, my Lord, you have aggravated this charge of narrowneſs, ſcantineſs, and obſcurity, againſt the Hebrew Language, to an extravagant and even dangerous degree. If the caſe ſhould really be, as You have ſtated it; there is an end of all certainty, and all authority, of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Teſtament. But, I hope, it is far otherwiſe. You ſay, that in the moſt antient MSS there was no ſpace left to diſtinguiſh one word from another. I muſt obſerve, that this opinion[n] was propagated by Elias Levita, who quotes the Cabbaliſts as his authors. It was a very convenient principle for them, whoſe buſineſs it was to make as many different ſenſes as poſſible out of one

[m] That I may be ſure not to miſrepreſent his Lordſhip's meaning; I give here his Definition of Pleonaſm, and the Cauſe to which he aſcribes it. " A Repetition of the ſame thing in " different words is called a Pleonaſm." Div. Leg. Vol. v, p. 258. " The Pleonaſm aroſe from the want of words." Vol. iii, p. 174.

[n] See Carpzovii Critica Sacra; Par. I, Cap. iii, Sect. v. Bartoloccii Biblioth. Rabbin. Par. iv, p. 186.

and

and the ſame ſentence. But this is affirmed only of one MS, that is, of the Copy of the Law as delivered by Moſes to the Iſraelites; which, according to ſome of the Cabbaliſts, was as one verſe, or, according to others, as one word: which is about as ſenſible a notion, as that other of ſome of the Jews, who ſay, that God pronounced the Ten Commandments all in one breath, without pauſe or diſtinction, as if it had been one continued word only. But this opinion of the Cabbaliſts is not only controverted by the Jewiſh Grammarians and Commentators, and the Talmudiſts; but is overthrown by the very reaſon of the thing, and its own abſurdity. You may ſay, as others have done, that this is actually the caſe of the antient Greek MSS: it is ſo, becauſe the nature of the Greek language allowed of it; and it is not difficult to ſeparate the words ſo confuſed in the Greek MSS, without miſtake or uncertainty. But it would be perhaps impracticable to do it in the Hebrew thus confuſed, and deſtitute of the Vowel-points; as it plainly appears by the example, which one °, who for certain reaſons has adopted this conceit, has given us in the three firſt words of Geneſis; out of which, written as one word, and arbitrarily divided, he extracts five different ſenſes, and ſays he could extract many more.

Again; "the HEBREW VERITY, you ſay, had "it not been for the Greek Tranſlation, would at

° Morinus, Exercitat. Biblicæ; Lib. i, Exerc. vi, Cap. 2.

this

"this day be a mere arbitrary CIPHER." Yes, my Lord, it would be a mere Cipher, to thoſe that have never learnt to read it; and the beſt reading-glaſſes in Bertrand's Shop would never help them to make any thing more of it. But, even though the Greek Tranſlation had never exiſted, (the great uſefulneſs of which I do by no means deny,) yet with the help of the other Dialects, the other antient Verſions, and Paraphraſes, the Maſoretic Pointing, the Grammars and Dictionaries of the later Jews, who certainly did not learn their Hebrew from the Greek Tranſlation; with all theſe aſſiſtances, I ſhould think, that eyes properly qualified might find it ſomething better than a mere Cipher. And however contemptuouſly your Lordſhip may think and ſpeak of the Hebrew Verity, and of thoſe that employ their pains upon it; yet this I will venture to ſay, that he who pretends to ſet up for a deep and critical Expoſitor of the Writers of the Old Teſtament, and of ſome of the moſt difficult of them in particular, with no knowledge, or at beſt a very ſuperficial knowledge, of Hebrew, tho' he may amuſe common readers with fanciful interpretations and ingenious hypotheſes, yet will be eſteemed by proper Judges, as no other than a Quack in Commentatorſhip, and a Mountebank in Criticiſm.

But if the HEBREW VERITY is to be conſidered at this day as a mere Cipher; I wiſh you had furniſhed us with a better Key to it than the Greek

Verſion. For, beſides that the Learned will hardly allow, what you aſſume as inconteſted, that [p] the Hebrew was a living language in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus; at which time too only the Pentateuch, that is, but one quarter of the Old Teſtament, was tranſlated into Greek; every one knows, that the Greek Verſion, called the Verſion of the Seventy, has come down to us in a miſerable condition, greatly mutilated, interpolated, and corrupted: and it comes ſo far ſhort of that accuracy, for which the genuine Septuagint Verſion was univerſally celebrated by the Antients, that ſome of the Learned [q], with Archbiſhop Uſher at their head, have made it a matter of doubt, whether the true Verſion of the Seventy be now extant. By a quotation from Abraham Echellenſis, you have made the caſe of the Alcoran parallel to that of the

[p] The beſt Critics are of opinion, that Hebrew was no longer a living language after the return from the Babyloniſh Captivity. Such are, among the Jews, Kimchi, Elias Levita, Ephodæus Grammaticus, &c. among the Chriſtians, Walton, Bochart, Buxtorf, Hottinger, Simon, &c. Not but that there were ſome few, the Prieſts and the old men, who might ſtill retain it. See Walton, Prolegom. iii, 24. Prideaux is much of the ſame opinion, though he places this period a little lower: he ſays, "the Hebrew Language certainly ceaſed to be vulgarly "ſpoken in the time of Ezra." Connect. Vol. i, p. 279. See alſo Vol. ii, p. 29. fol. "A diebus Eſdræ, ſays Maimo-"nides, (Tephil. Cap. xii, Sect. 10) conſueverunt habere "Interpretem, qui populo id interpretaretur, quod Lector ex "lege prælegit, ut ſenſum verborum intelligeret." If this was the caſe at, or ſoon after, the Return from the Captivity; what was it above two hundred and fifty years later, when the Pentateuch was firſt tranſlated into Greek?

[q] See Walton, Prolegom. ix. Fabricii Bibl. Græc. Lib. iii, Cap. xii, 5.

Old

Old Teſtament: but it appears by it, that the Alcoran is ſafe; for it was pointed by proper authority, while the Arabic was a living language; otherwiſe, JAM DE ALCORANO ACTUM ESSET: but as the Old Teſtament has not had the ſame good fortune, to have been pointed by proper authority, while the Hebrew was a living language; it follows from this judicious parallel, JAM ACTUM ESSE DE VETERI TESTAMENTO.

In ſhort, my Lord, through this whole paſſage You have been urging the ſame arguments, that the Fathers Morinus[r] and Simon employed in order to leſſen the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures, and ſo to bring us under the yoke of Popiſh Tradition: You have been urging the ſame arguments, that Spinoſa[s] employed in order to deſtroy the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures, and to introduce Infidelity and Atheiſm: You have carried the matter further than even Spinoſa himſelf dared to do: to treat the HEBREW VERITY as a mere CIPHER, this was reſerved for your Lordſhip, and the Author of *Sacerdotiſm Diſplayed*[t], whom I think you ſomewhere repreſent as the forwardeſt Devil of the whole Legion. And does our Chriſtian and

[r] Morini Exercitationes Biblicæ; Lib. i, Exerc. vi, Cap. 2. Simon, Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. Liv. iii, Chap. 2, 3, et paſſim.

[s] Tractatus Theol. Polit. Cap. vii.

[t] See p. 62 of *A Brief Examination of the Divine Legation of Moſes, by a Society of Gentlemen*; Lond. 1742: otherwiſe intitled, in the body of the book, *Sacerdotiſm Diſplayed*; and ſaid to be written by a *Select Committee of the Deiſts and Freethinkers of Great Britain.*

Proteſtant Biſhop join with Papiſts, and Infidels, and Atheiſts ——— Now methinks I hear you crying out aloud againſt *argumenta ad invidiam:* but remember Hobbes and our Profeſſor; there's a Rowland for your Oliver. You, my Lord, are of all the Writers of this age, except perhaps your Friend the Candid Examiner, the perſon who has the leaſt right to complain of ſuch arguments: yet you ſhall ſee, how generouſly I will deal with you. I fairly acquit you of all evil intent, in this ſuſpicious kind of argumentation, or rather this unguarded diſplay of your Hebrew Criticiſm: I impute it all to your Lordſhip's undertaking to treat of a ſubject, with which you appear to be very much unacquainted.

Having obviated the difficulties, which your Lordſhip has thrown in the way, I ſhall now attempt to enter a little further into this ſubject, and to give my opinion a little more particularly of the characters of ſome of the principal Hebrew Writers, and of the difference of ſtyle and manner which may, upon juſt grounds, be obſerved in them; yet only ſo far as may be neceſſary to throw ſome light upon the preſent queſtion, concerning the Age of the Book of Job.

Setting aſide then this Book at preſent as doubtful, Moſes ſtands at the head of the Hebrew Writers; not only in point of time, but in regard alſo of literary merit, as an Hiſtorian, as an Orator, and as a Poet. Whatever defects may be noted in his

his hiſtory upon the whole, when compared with the more regular and more laboured productions of the poliſhed Hiſtorians of Greece and Rome; yet in many parts of it, he has given evident marks of ſuperior abilities in the character of Hiſtorian. The hiſtory of Joſeph, for inſtance, is an example of ſimple, noble, elegant, intereſting, pathetic narration; of juſtneſs, neatneſs, and perſpicuity of hiſtoric compoſition; to which nothing equal, or in any degree comparable, can be produced from Herodotus or Xenophon, Salluſt or Livy. As an Orator; his exhortations in the Book of Deuteronomy have a force, a ſpirit, and an elegance, equal at leaſt to any thing of the ſame kind in the Prophets of a later age. As a Poet; his Prophetic Ode is ſuperior to every thing of its kind, except perhaps that of Iſaiah, Chap. XIV: and we have in this Ode of Moſes an excellent example of the Poetical Conſtruction, or the Sententious Style characteriſtic of Hebrew Poetry. It appears here in its juſt form, and full beauty; though properly tempered and chaſtiſed, nor carried to its utmoſt preciſion, and moſt laboured accuracy; which would not have been ſo ſuitable to the great ſublimity of the ſubject. And a like inſtance of judgment may be obſerved in Iſaiah's Ode above-mentioned: for though that Prophet is perhaps of all the Hebrew Poets the moſt elegant compoſer in that ſtyle; yet in this Ode he has not aimed at a ſtudied exactneſs of the ſhort ſententious conſtruction [u],

[u] See De Sacra Poeſi Hebr. Præl. xiii, xix, xxviii.

but

but has choſen a more free and flowing manner of compoſition. It may perhaps be ſaid, that this perfect accuracy of the ſententious ſtyle was not yet acquired, but was the late effect of progreſſive refinement: and that for this reaſon the author of Job, who is acknowledged to be very accurate in this manner of writing, was of a later age. That this is not ſo, will evidently appear from other examples of the earlieſt times, which are moſt perfect in the ſententious manner. In ſhort; Moſes's Writings, in various forms and characters of compoſition, are in no reſpect inferior to the productions of later ages of the Jewiſh Republic: and the language of Moſes is the very purity of the Hebrew tongue. However ſucceeding Writers may differ from him in ſtyle and manner; this difference is to be aſcribed to the peculiar turn and genius of thoſe writers, not to any improvements of ſcience, or refinements of language, in a more civilized and poliſhed age.

But further; in the Poetical ſtyle Moſes has not only given ſome excellent examples of his own faculty, but has likewiſe preſerved ſeveral ſpecimens of Poetry from other hands and of a higher age. He has given us the Prophecies of Jacob; which were in all probability delivered down to poſterity in their genuine form, as taken from the mouth of the Patriarch: theſe are in the ſame ſhort ſententious ſtyle; which, as it is the moſt diſtinguiſhing character of the Hebrew Poetry, ſo it appears by this, and other examples, to have been the moſt antient,

antient, the genuine and original mark of it. He has given us the Prophecies of Balaam; which are in this ſtyle the moſt perfect, the moſt poliſhed, the moſt exquiſite examples, that can be produced. There are certain Odes of Horace; which, for their exquiſite taſte, the delicacy of compoſition, purity of diction, and elegance of form, one might ſafely pronounce to be peculiar to the Auguſtan age, and that no ſucceeding age could poſſibly have produced them. The Prophecies of Balaam ſeem to me to have ſomething of this kind of peculiar caſt; a neatneſs, a purity, and preciſion in the ſententious manner, which the later ages ſeldom attained. I hardly know any thing in this kind, which can be ſet in competition with them; except the CXIV^th^ Pſalm, of a later age, (not higher, I gueſs, than the time of David) and ſome parts of Job, of an age, as I ſuppoſe, ſomewhat earlier than that of Balaam. From theſe conſiderations I preſume to mark the age of Moſes, as an age in which Hebrew Compoſition, both in Proſe and Verſe, was arrived at its full form of maturity and perfection; and to conclude, that the Excellence of the compoſition of the Poem of Job is no bar to its being aſcribed to that age, which You, my Lord, I think falſely, repreſent as unciviliſed and barbarous. And upon the moſt ſtrict examination of the ſtyle, manner, language, and poetical compoſition of that Poem, I believe it will appear to all proper judges to be more ſuitable to that age, the age equal or

ſome-

ſomewhat prior to the time of Moſes, than to any other whatſoever.

I ſhall very readily grant to your Lordſhip, that the Hebrew language varied very little from the time of Moſes to the Babyloniſh Captivity: nevertheleſs I think we may be allowed to form a judgment of the different ſtyle and manner of different authors in that long period. The peculiar ſtyle and manner of each of the three great Tragedians of Greece, though of nearly the ſame age, is very diſtinct and diſcernible: and yet Sophocles, Euripides, and Æſchylus are not in any proportion ſo different from one another in their ſtyle and manner, as the three great Prophets of the Hebrews, of ages reſpectively not much more diſtant, Iſaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezechiel. But what is the difference between theſe, in compariſon of the difference between the Author of the Book of Job and Ezra? Let any one properly qualified to judge in this matter read the plain hiſtorical narrative in the two firſt chapters of Job: it is neat, conciſe, clear in its order and method, pure and elegant in its expreſſion: let him turn to Ezra, and find, if he can, a ſingle Hebrew chapter, on which he can with a ſafe conſcience beſtow any part of this commendation. Let him moreover take into the account this laſt Author's barbarous terms; and then let him tell me fairly, whether he does not find as much difference between theſe two Writers, as between Salluſt and William of Malmſbury. Let him next look

look into the poetical parts of Job, and let him compare them with any part of Ezra's undoubted writings [w]; and I would then aſk him, whether he would not as ſoon pitch upon Geoffry of Monmouth for the Author of the Æneid, if that were a doubtful point, as Ezra for the Author of the Poem of Job: and I ſhould not much doubt of his anſwering in the affirmative.

All this, your Lordſhip may ſay, is *gratis dictum*; all the mere preſumption of Pedantry, the ape of

[w] The Author of Divine Legation, (Book vi, Sect. 2,) gives his favourite Ezra credit as the Writer of the Books of Chronicles and Eſther: and has recourſe to the tradition of the Jews, that he was the ſame perſon with Malachi. If he could prove this latter point, it might be of uſe to him: for I take the Writer of the Prophecy of Malachi to be much better qualified for *his* purpoſe than the Writer of the Book of Ezra. But leaving him to make good that point, as he may; why is Ezra "reaſonably ſuppoſed to be the Author of the two books of "Chronicles, and the book of Eſther?" Becauſe, forſooth, the Jews have ſaid ſo: *that*, I believe, is the beſt reaſon that can be given. The latter book indeed is much in the ſtyle and language of Ezra; but the narration ſeems of a better caſt. But as for the former part of the ſuppoſition, that Ezra was Author of the Chronicles; nothing can well be more unreaſonable. Ezra might poſſibly be the Collector, and Editor, of the books of Chronicles; but certainly was not the Author. For the books of Chronicles are evidently, like the books of Kings, a Collection from the Hiſtorical writings of the antient Seers and Prophets. They cite the Books, the Prophecies, and Viſions, of Samuel, Nathan, Gad, Ahijah, Iddo, &c. The Collector copied the very words of the ſeveral Authors; as is manifeſt from hence, that the books of Kings and Chronicles frequently agree with one another in words, for many ſentences together. See Sir Iſaac Newton's Obſervations on Daniel; p. 8. Beſides, it may be demonſtrably proved, that ſome parts of the books of Chronicles were written *before* the Babyloniſh Captivity. See 2 Chron. v, 9: viii, 8: x, 19.

Criticiſm. My Lord, I only give it, with all deference, as my humble opinion: I do no more than expreſs my own ſenſe, and my own feelings: I do not pretend to give mere opinion and conjecture, my own fancies perhaps and ſurmiſes, for Demonſtration. However, upon this opinion, precarious as I acknowledge it to be, I will venture to ſtake my credit: " nec recuſo, quin, quantum de hac " ſententia, tantundem de mei judicii exiſtimatione " detrahatur."

Your Lordſhip is very ſhort upon the laſt argument, touched upon in my offenſive Note; in which I ſhall follow your example: for in truth it does not require much diſcuſſion. " This excellent " Writer" [to wit, the Candid Examiner] " de- " ſired to know of the learned, *Where they could* " *find a Civil or Religious Conſtitution out of Judea,* " *which declared, that the Children ſhould ſuffer for* " *the crime of their Parents.*" As your Lordſhip has here improperly ſtated the queſtion; it is very eaſily anſwered, but nothing to the purpoſe: for by the Laws of every Conſtitution in the world the Children do, in many caſes, ſuffer for the crimes of their Parents; as in the caſe of Confiſcation, Attainder, and the like; and it cannot be otherwiſe. As the Candid Examiner himſelf has rightly ſtated the queſtion, it ſtands thus: " Where did GOD " ever declare, that HE would uſe this mode of " puniſhment, but in the Jewiſh Law?" But this itſelf is very little more to the purpoſe: for whether

ther God ever declared it, or not; or whether the opinion, that God would uſe this mode of puniſhment, be in its nature capable of being made a part of any Civil Conſtitution beſide that of the Jews, or not; yet this opinion may have prevailed in every nation under heaven: which is fully ſufficient to deſtroy your argument. That the ſentiment occurring in Job, "that God layeth up the "Father's iniquity for his Children," is no proof that the Poem muſt have been written by a Jew, I ſhewed by producing the ſame ſentiment from Horace. Your Lordſhip ſays, this is paying with *an old ſong*, giving *rhime for reaſon*; or, in plain Engliſh, taking it out of your facetious language, that it is nothing at all to the purpoſe. What, my Lord, no more to the purpoſe, than

"*Of a noble race was Shinkin?*"

I beg your pardon; I think it not only to the purpoſe, but even deciſive. For if that ſentiment proves, that the Poem of Job was written by a Jew; the ſame ſentiment proves, that the Ode[x] of Horace was written by a Jew; and that another Ode, commonly alſo ſuppoſed of the ſame Poet, in which the ſame ſentiment likewiſe occurs, was alſo written by a Jew. In truth, the ſentiment in queſtion (whether founded on experience, or reaſon, or revelation, whether true or falſe, it matters not to our purpoſe) is a Popular Opinion, common to all nations, and all ages, of the world. I intimated

[x] Carm. Lib. iii, Ode vi, 1: and Lib. i, Ode xxviii, 30.

plainly enough, that I could give more examples of the ſame ſort, upon demand: and ſince your Lordſhip ſeems not to be ſatisfied with this, I ſhall add at the bottom of the page a few others [y]. And if required,

[y] Qui (Dionyſius, Syracuſarum tyrannus) tametſi debita ſupplicia non exolvit, dedecore tamen filii mortuus pœnas rependit, quas vivus effugerat. Lento enim gradu ad vindictam ſui divina procedit ira, tarditatemque ſupplicii gravitate compenſat. Valerius Max. Lib. i, Cap. 1.

——— Satis jam pridem ſanguine noſtro
Laomedonteæ luimus perjuria gentis.

VIRGIL. Georg. i, 501.

——— Di capiti ipſius generique reſervent.

VIRGIL. Æneid. viii, 484.

Τα των τεκοντων σφαλματ' εις τους εκγονους
Οἱ θεοι τρεπουσι.

EURIPIDES, in Excerptis Grotii; p. 423.

Ζευ πατερ, ειθε γενοιτο θεοις φιλα, τοις μεν αλιτροις
Ὑβριν ἀδειν, και σφιν τουτο γενοιτο φιλον
Θυμῳ, σχετλια εργα μετα φρεσιν ὁστις απηνης
Εργαζοιτο, θεων μηδεν οπιζομενος,
Αυτον επειτα παλιν τισαι κακα, μηδε τ' οπισσω
Πατρος ατασθαλιη παισι γενοιτο κακον.
Παιδες, δ' οἱ τ' αδικου πατρος τα δικαια νοεοντες
Ποιουσι, Κρονιδη, σον χολον αζομενοι,
Εξ αρχης τα δικαια μετ' αστοισιν φιλεοντες,
Μητιν ὑπερβασιην αντιτινειν πατερων.
Ταυτ' ειη μακαρεσσι θεοις φιλα· νυν δ' ὁ μεν ερδων
Εκφευγει, το κακον δ' αλλος επειτα φερει.

THEOGNIS; 729.

Τοιαυτη Ζηνος πελεται τισις· ουδ' εφ' ἑκαστῳ,
Ὡσπερ θνητος ανηρ, γιγνεται οξυχολος,
Αει δ' ουτε λεληθε Διαμπερες ὁστις αλιτρον
Θυμον εχει, παντως δ' ες τελος εξεφανη·

Αλλ'

required, I might perhaps undertake to prove, by the ſame argument by which you have demonſtrated, that Job was written by a Jew, that half the writings of the Greeks and Romans were likewiſe written by the Jews.

" The contemptuous Profeſſor :" —— Yes, my Lord ; the Profeſſor does avow a perfect contempt for a miſerable Caviller, who proſtitutes his pen to do the drudgery of an imperious Taſk-maſter. I ſee, my Lord, you have intimated your orders to him to take the Prelections in hand, once more : and may I not hope then for the honour of *your Lordſhip*'s animadverſions ? *In good time :* when the Candid Examiner underſtands Latin a little better ; and when your Lordſhip has a competent know-

Αλλ' ὁ μεν αυτικ' ετισεν, ὁ δ' ὑςερον· ει δε φυγωσιν
Αυτοι, μηδε θεων μοιρ' επιȣσα κιχῃ,
Ηλυθε παντως, αυτικ' αναιτιοι εργα τινȣσιν
Οι παιδες τȣτων ἡγεμονων οπισω.

SOLON ; 25.

Τοις δε κακως ῥηξασι δικης τελος ȣχι χρονιςον
Ουδ' * απαραιτητον, ȣδ' ει Διος εγγονοι ειεν.
Αλλ' αυτων κεφαλῃσι και εν σφετεροισι τεκεσσιν
Ειλειται, και πημα δομοις επι πηματι βαινει.

Oraculum Delph. apud Ælian.
Var. Hiſt. Lib. iii, 43.

* Lege f. Ουδε παραιτητον.

See alſo the Electra of Sophocles, ver. 505 : and laſtly, Plutarch's Treatiſe, intitled, *De his qui ſero a Numine puniuntur* ; the greater part of which (from p. 556. Edit. Francofurt 1599, fol.) is upon the ſame ſubject.

ledge

ledge of Hebrew. And *a little more civility* too may *not be amiſs:* for if he, who has *demoliſhed* the Appendix, *ſhould take it into his head to examine* the Book itſelf; he might poſſibly make ſome havock in *The Divine Legation of Moſes Demonſtrated.*

In the mean time I reſt,

My Lord,

Your Lordſhip's

Moſt humble Servant,

A Late Profeſſor
in THE UNIVERSITY of
OXFORD.

Auguſt 31, 1765.

APPENDIX;

CONTAINING

A FORMER

LITERARY CORRESPONDENCE.

LETTER I.

To The Reverend Dr W.

Wincheſter Sept. 9. 1756.

Dear Sir,

OUR good Friends Dr C. and Mr S. have agreably to your deſire communicated to me ſome particulars of the converſation, which you have lately had with them relating to me: from which I collect, that you think you have reaſon to be offended with me on account of ſome things which I have ſaid in my Prelections on the ſubject of the Book of Job, which you look upon as aimed againſt you; and that you expect that I ſhould explain myſelf on this head. I am much obliged to you for the regard which you have been pleaſed to expreſs for me, and for your candid and generous manner of dealing with me on this occaſion: and I ſhall endeavour to return it by dealing as fairly and as openly with you.

The reaſons for my treating of the Book of Job in the manner which I have done, leſt they ſhould be miſtaken, I have there given; and that I might

not give offence, have prefaced thoſe Lectures with an Apology, which was perhaps unneceſſary. Having examined and conſidered the Subject as well as I was able, I found myſelf obliged to differ in opinion from ſeveral Writers of great Authority in the Republic of Letters; ſuch as Grotius, Le Clerc, Biſhop Hare, Yourſelf, and many others: it was not my buſineſs, and much leſs was it my deſire, to enter into a formal diſpute with any one; all I had to do was to declare in a few words my own ſentiments, and to explain my Hypotheſis, ſo far as to make myſelf underſtood, when I came to treat of the ſubject; which it was abſolutely neceſſary for me to treat of, as being a principal and eſſential part of my plan. I thought the Book of Job the moſt antient extant, that it had no relation to the affairs of the Iſraelites, that it was neither Allegorical nor properly Dramatic; in all which I diſagreed not only with You, but with one, or other, or all, of the Authors above-mentioned, and a hundred others, whom I need not name to you now, nor was it at all more neceſſary for me to name them then. You ſeem to think I ought to have quoted you, or referred to your Book: and a Friend of yours charges me with writing againſt you, and being afraid of you. Your Friend is miſtaken in both theſe particulars; and the ground of your complaint I cannot poſſibly comprehend. Why ſhould I ſingle out you, and attack you for opinions, which were common to you with twenty other Authors of note? would this have been a mark

mark of reſpect to you? would it not rather have argued a buſy and a litigious ſpirit in me? There were ſeveral living Writers of great Learning and Eminence, who ſtood juſt in the ſame ſituation with regard to me, that you did. What ſhould I have done? Should I have agreed with you all? that was impoſſible. Should I have complimented you all, or ſhould I have contended with you all? to have done either would have been equally unneceſſary and impertinent. I have never heard, that any of thoſe Gentlemen have been offended with me, for acting with reſpect to them juſt in the ſame manner as I have done with reſpect to you.

But You too it ſeems think, that I have written againſt you; that is, that I have aimed at you in particular, and attacked opinions that are peculiarly yours. I have upon this occaſion taken a review of your Diſſertation, and of my own Lectures, and cannot find upon what it is that you ground this charge. I have marked the paſſages in the latter which ſeemed moſt likely to have given you umbrage, and beg you would give yourſelf the trouble to turn to them. Pag. 312. *Nunquam in dubium* &c. this cannot poſſibly be underſtood of you, being plainly reſtrained to thoſe who conclude, that if the Poem be Parabolical, therefore the Story is Fictitious; the abſurdity of which you yourſelf expoſe. In P. 319, I refer to the diſpute on the Text ſuppoſed to relate to the Reſurrection; to the Biſhop of London, Dr Hodges &c. I believe, I

had not you then in my thoughts; however if I had, I ſee nothing that ſhould offend you or any one. Pag. 320, obſerve, that I ſpeak of the opinion, that the Poem is Dramatic, as what has for ſome time almoſt univerſally prevailed among the Learned. Beſides, I do not ſee how the queſtion, whether the Poem be ſtrictly Dramatic or not, at all affects your main argument. So that this Diſcourſe upon the whole cannot be ſuppoſed to be directed particularly againſt you. In the next page I point out more particularly the Authors whom I have in view, by uſing their own expreſſions: *laquuntur enim* &c. To give you full ſatisfaction here, and at the ſame time to ſave you and myſelf the trouble of a multitude of references, I beg leave to refer you only to two ſhort paſſages: Biſhop Hare's note at the end of the CVIIth Pſalm; and Calmet's Preface to Job, about the middle, the Paragraph begins with, *Mais ſans nier* &c. where you will find enough to account for every thing I have there ſaid, and even for every expreſſion which I have uſed. If there are any other paſſages which offend you as meant of you particularly, I aſſure you moſt ſincerely that they have eſcaped my notice; be ſo good as to point them out to me, and I will endeavour to give you further ſatisfaction.

Upon the whole, I did not mean to offend, neither do I think I have given any cauſe of offence. The ſubject lay at leaſt as much in my way, as it did in yours: I had as good a right to purſue my ſubject,

ſubject, and to deliver my ſentiments with freedom, as you had. I could not have ſpoken upon it at all without diſſenting from you in conjunction with many others, and I don't know how I could have ſignified my diſſent more inoffenſively. I cannot have miſrepreſented your particular notions, for I never intended to repreſent them at all, nor had I any thing to do with them. Nay, as far as I can recollect, I verily believe, that at the time when I wrote thoſe Lectures I had not your book before me; ſo far was it from my intention to cavil at your Diſſertation. In a word, my Lectures, and every expreſſion in them, might have ſtood juſt as they do now, though your Diſſertation on Job had never been written.

I beg the continuance of that regard and eſteem, which you have been ſo kind as to expreſs towards me: I will not now tell you how highly I ſhall prize it: your Friend above-mentioned, the Author of the Diſſertation on the Delicacy of Friendſhip has ſtopped my mouth, and makes me very cautious of ſaying any thing that may be conſtrued into flattery or fear of you. I call him your Friend, becauſe I ſuppoſe he pretends be ſo: what your opinion of him is, I cannot tell; but I think you owe him little thanks for his pains. He has at leaſt ſhewn more zeal than diſcretion in the undertaking, and more malevolent wit than good ſenſe or honeſt intention in the performance; the manifeſt tendency of which is to ſow ſtrife, and to foment diſcord; and its natural effect, if it has any, muſt be to leſ-

ſen

ſen the number of thoſe, who wiſh well to you and your deſigns: and I ſay ſo much of it in order to aſſure you, that it will not have that effect with me.

As to my opinions, if they ſtand at all in your way, and if you ſhould think them worthy of your notice, I aſk not your favour for them: you will treat them as you ſhall think your own cauſe and the cauſe of truth requires. I do not as yet ſee any reaſon to depart from them; but am not ſo fond of them, as to be inclined to enter into a diſpute with any one in defence of them. I ſhall be offended with no man merely for differing from me in ſentiment upon any ſubject; much leſs upon points ſo very doubtful, and upon which no two perſons, out of all that examine and judge for themſelves, either ever have agreed, or probably ever will perfectly agree. As to the manner in which you ſhall treat them, I leave it entirely to your own conſideration; I ſhall be very little concerned about it. If you uſe me otherwiſe than I deſerve, your own character will ſuffer, and not mine. Lay aſide all regard to me upon this occaſion; but reſpect Yourſelf and the Public.

I am, Dear Sir,

Your moſt obedient

humble Servant,

R. L.

LETTER II.

To The Reverend Dr L.

Prior Park [Sept.] 17. 1756.

Dear Sir,

I HAD, this day, the favour of your Letter of the 9th, and think my ſelfe much obliged to our two Brethren for this good office, which I hope will have the deſired effect: And to promote it, all I can, I will follow your example in the frankneſs and openneſs of this eclairciſſement.

My complaint was not for your differing from me; nor yet for your manner of expreſſing that difference; but for, what I conceived to be, a miſrepreſenting me. — You yourſelfe ſhall be judge. P. 64 — non eo quod *permanere poſt mortem animos non crederent*, quod doctis quibuſdam placuit; ſed —— You won't deny that I am here meant. Yet you might have underſtood by my book, that I hold, " that the early, as well as later, Jews believed the permanency of the Soul; only, having nothing, in their Law, of a ſtate of future rewards and puniſhments, the early Jews had no intereſting reflections concerning that permanency, and paid no attention to it.

P. 65 — neque eos hac in parte vel minimum ſacri codices adjuvere; haud quia hanc iis cognitionem *invideret* Divina Revelatio, ſed quia — Was it not invidious, to inſinuate that I had repreſented divine Revelation as *envying* or grudging the Jews this bleſſing? when I had ſhewn the reaſon to be, that it did not belong to their Œconomy; not for that ſtrange reaſon, quia humanæ mentis conditio eam omnino non recipiat, but becauſe the doctrine of life and immortality was reſerved for another Teacher. I call your reaſon, a ſtrange one, becauſe the moſt ignorant and unlettered are capable of comprehending all that Chriſtianity teaches concerning this matter. But I apprehend, in the words I here allude to, you entirely miſtake the queſtion you was upon —— Qualis itaque ab animis a corpore ſejunctis vita viveretur, quis eorum locus, forma, conditio, Hebræi *juxta cum cæteris mortalibus* in ſumma ignoratione verſabantur. For the queſtion was not, Whether the reſt of mankind had *juſter* notions of the ſtate and condition of the ſoul in a ſtate of ſeparation; but Whether they had not the national beliefe of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments in general, which the Jews wanted. It is this alſo, which is the proper ſubject for *poetic* ornament, (the thing you are upon) not the metaphyſic truth of things, which is too meagre for this entertainment; (as you may ſee by the 6th B. of Virgil) as well as too abſtracted for the *condition of the human mind.*

P. 321.

P. 321. — Cum Poema Jobi pro *vero* ac *legitimo* Dramate *cujuſmodi ſunt Græcorum Tragœdiæ* minime haberi poſſe contenderem —— Had the reflection ended here, I could not poſſibly have gueſſed whom you had in your eye: Becauſe, I believe, no critic on this ſide the cape of good hope ever ſaid or thought, the book of Job to be of the ſpecies of the greek Drama. But when I read the following words — Hoc autem ut concedamus, vix erit ſatis; Sunt qui majus quiddam poſtulare videntur. Loquuntur enim de rerum conſtitutione, de Cataſtrophe dramatis, Θεον απο μηχανης induci dicunt —— iiſdem certe vocibus utuntur &c. When I read this, I ſay, I could no longer doubt, that *I only* was meant; becauſe I ſpeak of all theſe things; and of the *God from the machine*, no one could ſpeak but me; becauſe no one elſe, in their interpretations of the book of Job, contended for the thing underſtood by it. You ſeem your ſelfe to have been ſenſible that this needed a ſoftening, by your corrective, — *iiſdem certe vocibus utuntur*. Perhaps tho', you may think, that my applying the terms of the Greek ſtage, to this book, fairly inferred that I ſuppoſed the writing to be of the ſame ſpecies. If ſo, give me leave to obſerve, I could do no other, tho' I thought it of a different ſpecies. Whoever goes about to ſhew that a work is of ſuch or ſuch a *genus*, if he would write intelligibly he cannot avoid uſing the terms of that *ſpecies* of it, which is beſt known and underſtood. Thus when I ſay, Religion compoſes a *Society*, and, in my account of

the nature of this Society, I make uſe of the words, Magiſtrates, Laws, Sanctions (words which properly belong to civil Society) am I to be underſtood as holding, that Religion is of that *Species*, called civil Society, or that it is of the *genus* only of Society? But to prove, you are diſpoſed to do as much honour to the book of Job as any man, you conclude, by ſhewing, that the book has not all the artifice of the Greek drama; yet the Compoſer was capable of giving it that advantage. —— Profecto qui reputabit &c. is nunquam poterit ſine ſumma admiratione intueri tot ante ſæculis natum Poema, tam pulchre inventum, tam ſolerter diſpoſitum, tam perfecte expletum, tam ſingularis exempli; quod ſimilitudinem atque imaginem quandam Dramatis ſtatim arripuit, unde non difficile fuiſſet ad ipſum abſoluti operis exemplar aſcendere &c. Which would put one in mind of the religious caution of good Sir R. Blackmore, who, in his paraphraſe of this famous book, aſſures us, that tho' he will not poſitively affirm, that Job actually *waſhed his feet in butter*, yet he makes it plainly out, that Job's Dairy afforded butter enough for that purpoſe.

And now, Sir, reflect a little without prejudice: and aſk your ſelfe, Whether theſe paſſages bear the leaſt mark of good, or even of indifferent will, towards me; tho' I ſhould allow (as I am very ready to do) that you had no formed intention of miſrepreſenting me.

If

If you ſhould ſay, your deſign was that they ſhould neither bear the marks of good, or of evil will, towards me, (this neutrality being all, as your letter ſeems to hint, I had to expect of you) then let me go on to a paſſage or two, which ſeem to ſpeak your diſpoſition ſtill ſtronger.

P. 312 — nimirum carmen hoc in Iſraelitarum ſolatium compoſitum fuiſſe, eorumque res aliquo modo adumbrare; quam ipſum eſſe VANISSIMUM arbitror: cum morum, rituum, rerum Iſraeliticarum, *nulla veſtigia*, nullam ſpeciem, aut umbram reperio. I dare appeal to your ingenuity, that I muſt needs be here meant. And will your politeneſs allow you to ſay, that the *vaniſſimum* was civil; or your modeſty, that the *nulla veſtigia* was decent, when I believe moſt competent readers are agreed, that there are infinitely more and ſtronger marks that the affairs under the Theocracy are alluded to, than that Auguſtus is ſhadowed under Virgil's Hero. Nor can I well reconcile this dogmatical ſentence with what you ſay in your letter, of the *ſo doubtful* nature of the queſtion we are divided about, where you attempt to ſhew how little reaſon I have to be offended with thoſe who differ from me.

Again you ſay, Nunquam in dubium vocata fuiſſet Hiſtoriæ [Jobi] veritas, niſi Allegoriarum Conquiſitoribus tantum placuiſſent ſuæ fictiones, ut nihil amplecti vellent quod non umbratile eſſet & commentitium. Now I will readily allow, that if, by theſe Allegoriſers, you mean thoſe who annihi-

late the litteral ſenſe, you could not mean me; becauſe, as you obſerve, I have expoſed their folly. But would it have been more than juſtice, when you uſed ſuch general expreſſions, to have diſtinguiſhed my Allegory from theirs? Again, If it ſhould be aſked, Why ſo much unwillingneſs to have the book of Job an Allegory, and ſo much readineſs to admitt Solomon's Song to be an *entire Allegory?* Could you give a better reaſon than this, that the latter opinion is eſtabliſhed orthodoxy, and the former, yet, a paradox? But, a word in your ear; Can you poſſibly be ſerious in ſaying, of Solomon's Song, *omnino eſſe Allegoricum?* I pay you a compliment in this queſtion: tho' I made it only to ſhew you, that I treat you in the freedom and confidence of a friendly Altercation[a].

To proceed with your Letter. The general turn of it is to ſhew me, that I am unreaſonable in expecting common civilities from you, in a book where I lay ſo much in your way. Now give me leave to think, you ſeem neither rightly to underſtand your ſelfe, nor me. My ſervices to religion and Society ſeem to intitle me to common reſpect, when my opinions are controverted and decried, from every man of letters, engaged in the ſame cauſe, where no perſonal animoſities have inter-

[a] The latter part of this Paragraph, as imparted in confidence, and the anſwer to it likewiſe, would have been here ſuppreſſed: but it was judged altogether unneceſſary to do ſo, when it was obſerved, that the ſame ſecret had been whiſpered in confidence to the ear of the Public, in Div. Leg. Vol. v, p. 63, Note.

vened.

vened. To *neglect* this, is not knowing the world: to *decline* it muſt be from fear of giving offence. If therefore the Author of the *delicacy of friendſhip* thought, a Writer of ſo much caution and reſerve, might be as backward to give offence to *me*, as to others, and for the ſame prudential reaſons, he was very excuſable, in his conjecture.

But you tell me, you are not afraid of me; and you affect to tell me ſo, again and again. All I will ſay to this is, that whoever injures me may not, at the long run, have reaſon to applaud his ſituation. But no man need be afraid of him he has not injured. And I am very ready to believe, that it is a conſcioufneſs of that, which makes you ſo brave. For my own part, I am not fond of reſenting that, as an injury, which was never intended.

You ſpeak your ſentiments of the Author and the Pamphlet on the *delicacy of Friendſhip*: allow me to tell you mine. You make it a kind of queſtion, whether he be my friend. This is natural. Your notion of the commerce, amongſt learned men, in letters, may make you a little dazzled with ſuch a friendſhip, in the commerce of life. The Author, (if I know who was the Author, for the pamphlet was publiſhed before I had ſo much as heard of the contents) is a man of very ſuperior talents of genius, learning, and virtue; indeed a principal ornament of the age he lives in: ſo that was I to wiſh a bleſſing to the man I was moſt obliged to, I could not wiſh him a greater than the friendſhip

of

of ſuch a perſon. And I not only hold my ſelfe highly honoured, and obliged to him, for this mark of his good will towards me, but think the diſcourſe very ſerviceable to men of Letters, if they would condeſcend to make a proper uſe of it. He tries, in the fineſt irony in the world, to ſhame them out of that deteſtable turn of mind which, either out of a low envy is unwilling to give merit its due, or out of mean and baſe apprehenſions dare not do it, for fear of its being unacceptable to their Superiors: And it was impoſſible for him to have choſen a properer object of his ſatire than the man he has choſen. The only thing blamable, and which, by the way, is the only real ground of offence, is his extravagant commendation of me. And if the generoſity and *immoderate* warmth of a friendly heart will not excuſe him (as it would be a wonder if ſo unexperienced a thing, ſhould) I know myſelf ſo well, as to be conſcious, he has nothing better to urge.

To draw to a concluſion. You ſay, I am at liberty to purſue my own meaſures, *if your opinions ſtand at all in my way.* I will aſſure you, they do not. If I had any purpoſe of examining them, it was only while I thought my ſelfe injuriouſly treated. You aſſure me I was not. The negligence of it, I can very well bear.

However, you adviſe me to *reſpect my ſelfe and the Public.* How ready I am to follow it, you may underſtand by my paſt conduct. Can more reſpect be

be ſhewn the Public, by an Author, than by never giving any thing to them but what he deemed of high importance to the intereſts of Religion and Society? And can juſter reſpect be ſhewn to my ſelfe, than, when I have been attacked, in the moſt injurious manner, by above a hundred Scribblers of all ranks and profeſſions, never to committ my ſelfe with above two or three? not to mention that principal reſpect to ones ſelfe, the never *beginning* a literary altercation with any man.

It would anſwer no end to tell you, what I thought of the Author of the *Hebrew Poetry*, before I ſaw him. But this I may ſay, that I was never more ſurprized, when I did ſee him, than to find him of ſo amiable and gentle manners, of ſo modeſt, ſenſible and diſengaged a deportment. It would not have diſpleaſed me to find my ſelfe ill uſed by Pedants and Bigots; but it grieved me to think, I had any thing to explain, with ſuch a man.

You have here, Dear Sir, a faithful picture of my mind; frank but honeſt; and, if plain, yet generous; above all, a Lover of Truth and good Men: Not the moſt forbearing when I think my ſelf ill treated; but ready to be reconciled by the leaſt ſhadow of a ſatisfaction.

Such as I am, I am at your ſervice; that is,

Your faithful and very obedient Servant,

W. W.

LETTER III.

To The Reverend Dr W.

Wincheſter Oct. 6. 1756.

Dear Sir,

I AM in the firſt place to return you my ſincere thanks for the candor of your ſentiments and expreſſions with regard to me in ſeveral parts of the Letter with which I am favoured: for your readineſs to allow that I had no formed intention of miſrepreſenting you; to believe that I was conſcious I had not injured you; to admit of the leaſt ſhadow of a ſatisfaction; and (if I do not flatter my wiſhes by interpreting your words too much in my favour) even to honour me with your friendſhip. Your remaining ſtill unſatisfied with my expreſſions, tho' you abſolve me of any ill intention, is a circumſtance that makes your preſent diſpoſition towards me but the more obliging: and I ſhould make but an ill return to it, unleſs I uſed my beſt endeavours to give you perfect ſatisfaction. This taſk therefore I reſume very willingly, and with full confidence of ſucceeding in it.

I was not informed that your complaint extended to any part of my book beſide the Lectures on Job;

ſo

ſo could not think of looking after any other paſſages that might be liable to ſuſpicion. But you begin with p. 64 &c. As you have totally miſtaken my deſign throughout this paſſage, and many of my expreſſions, the readieſt way to ſatisfy you with regard to it, will be to aſcertain my meaning. My purpoſe was to ſhew, that the Sacred Poets in deſcribing the State of the Dead make uſe of ſenſible Images taken from their manner of Sepulture; and to give the reaſons why they deſcribe it in this manner, and in this only: namely, becauſe the ſubject is really inexplicable in any other way; becauſe we have no idea of the metaphyſical nature of the Soul, of its form, ſituation, and manner of exiſtence in a ſeparate ſtate; becauſe, from the nature of the human faculties, the Inſpired Writers could have no advantage above others in this caſe; and becauſe they had no Syſtematical Metaphyſics to help them out, and to enable them to talk themſelves and others, as the modern Philoſophers do, into a perſuaſion that they really know ſomething of the matter. Theſe I ſay were the reaſons for their invariably expreſſing themſelves in this way: not that they wanted the knowledge of the permanency of the Soul after death, as certain Learned perſons have held. ——— So much for the courſe of my reaſoning in general: now for my particular expreſſions. " Qualis itaque — haud quia hanc " cognitionem iis invideret Divina Revelatio, ſed" &c. *hanc cognitionem*, nimirum, qualis ab animis a corpore ſejunctis vita viveretur, quis &c. not

the general Knowledge of a Future State, the plain Doctrine of Life and Immortality; but the particular Knowledge of the eſſence of the Soul, its manner of exiſtence in a ſeparate ſtate, its place, form, and condition. I had ſaid but juſt before, that the Vates Sacri, the Inſpired Writers, were poſſeſs'd of the belief of the Immortality of the Soul, and of the Reſurrection of the Body: here I ſay that the Hebrews in general, Inſpired Writers and all, were in the ſame caſe with all other mortals, and wholly deſtitute of *this* Knowledge; that is, not ſurely of the Immortality, but of the Metaphyſical Nature of the Soul. I never ſpoke of Divine Revelation's grudging the former to any: nor of the latter, as if it could be a bleſſing to any. Be ſo good now as to review this paſſage fairly, and ſee if I am chargeable with the abſurd reaſoning, the miſtaking the queſtion, the miſrepreſentations, and invidious reflections upon you, which you impute to me. I have ſaid, that the Inſpired Writers (and obſerve that I confine it to them all along) believed the Immortality of the Soul; tho' certain Learned perſons have denied, that they did believe it: are you one of thoſe Learned perſons? have not you declared your ſentiments upon that head, and in the affirmative, that the Inſpired Writers had the knowledge and belief of a Future State? have not you proved, that Moſes knew the Immortality of the Soul, and that it is deducible from his Writings? that the Prophets gave ſtrong intimations of it, and gradually revealed it? How then could

you

you poſſibly ſuppoſe, that you were here meant? Have I ſaid one word of the national belief of the Jews, or of a Future State's being contained in, or making a part of the Moſaic diſpenſation; of its being or not being a Sanction of their Law, or any thing elſe, which could lead you away ſo totally out of ſight of my meaning? Have I expreſſed myſelf vaguely, inaccurately, obſcurely? I think, I have not; at leaſt I profeſs 'tis beyond my ability to do it better in a language not familiar to me. Did not you rather read it with prejudice, with an unreaſonable jealouſy and ſuſpicion, that determined you to take offence, whether it was given or no? But enough of this, I hope. I ſhall only add, in order to be as explicit with you as poſſible, that the Author whom I principally had in view was Le Clerc: ſee his Comment. Index ad Hagiogr. in voce *Immortalitas*.

You inſiſt upon the paſſage P. 321, as meant of you, and of *you only*; "becauſe you ſpeak of the things there mentioned; and of the *God from the Machine* no one could ſpeak but you; becauſe no one elſe, in their interpretations of the Book of Job, contended for the thing underſtood by it." Now I had not only intimated to you before, that if my only deſign had been to deſtroy your Hypotheſis, I ſhould have beſtowed my pains to little purpoſe, by urging an argument that could not affect it; for allowing Job to be, as I contend, not a juſt Drama, but a mere Dialogue, your Allego-

ry, as far as I can ſee, ſtands juſt where it did before: but moreover, to give you full ſatisfaction on this head, I had referred you to two ſhort paſſages, in which alone you might have found enough to account for every expreſſion I have there uſed. By your not being ſatisfied, I conclude that you have not looked on thoſe paſſages to which I referred you; perhaps you had not the Books at hand. I will therefore tranſcribe them for you. I ſhall add no more upon this article; and ſhall expect to hear no more of it from you. Calmet, *Preface ſur Job*; he is recounting the ſentiments of ſeveral Writers: —— " Il s' eſt trouvé pluſieurs Ecrivains qui ont doutè de la veritè de l' hiſtoire qu' il contient. Ils traitent de paraboles & d' allegories tout ce qui y eſt raconté. Ils veulent que Job, &c. ſoient de noms feints & empruntez; que tout ce recit ſoit fait à plaiſir; — une piece de Poeſie; — non ce qui étoit en effet, mais ce qui pouvoit être. Pour appuyer cette opinion on releve le merveilleux — de cette hiſtoire. Un Prince puiſſant, heureux, &c (a ſhort account of the ſubject) —— Dieu entre dans cette diſpute, paroit dans un tourbillon, comme l' on dit: *Deus e machina*; Il juge en faveur de Job, condamne ſes amis, & retablit le premier dans tout ſes biens. Quoi de plus ſemblable que tout cela à une *Tragedie?* Les *Actes*, les *Scenes*, les *Perſonnages*, le *Denoüement*, le *Marveilleux*, tous les *Caracteres*, y ſont admirablement bien obſervez. Les trois premiers Chapitres ſont comme le *Prelude* de la piece. Ils en expliquent le ſujet;

ſujet ; ils font connoitre les perſonnages. Le premier *Acte* commence au Chap. III, & finit au Ch. XV. Le ſecond *Acte* commence au Ch. XV, & finit au Ch. XXII. Le 3me *Acte* commence au Ch. XXII, & finit au Ch. XXX. C'eſt en cet endroit que Dieu ſe fait voir, & fournit le Denoüement de le Tragedie." —— Biſhop Hare, Note on Pſ. CVII. 40. " Liceat hic obiter obſervare librum iſtum (Jobi) non modo metro, ut Pſalmos, ſcriptum eſſe, ſed certiſſime Drama ſacrum eſſe ; quod cum aliis argumentis, tum *hoc maxime* conſtat ; quod ſi totum librum in ſeptem æquales partes dividas, quatuor implent Jobus & tres amici ejus, primis capitibus connumeratis, quintam Jobus ſolus, ſextam Elihuus, ſeptimam Deus." (He muſt mean that theſe ſeven parts were ſtrictly ſpeaking ſeven *Acts* ; elſe how is this the ſtrongeſt argument, or indeed any argument at all, of its being a Drama ?) " Elihuus Dei cauſam in ſe recipit ; — Deus vero ipſe tandem introducitur ; — ut mæſtiſſimo Dramati Καταστροφη tandem felix obtingat."

Pag. 312. Here you think I am wanting in decency and civility with regard to you ; and charge me with talking dogmatically. I had but juſt before, in the Paragraph immediately preceding, deſired to be underſtood as propoſing what I had to ſay, non quaſi comperta ac plane percepta, ſed in opinione poſita ; and p. 294, had profeſſed, that upon this Subject I ſhould rather give the opinions of others than my own. And here I deliver it as my

my opinion, in which as you well know I only follow many Authors generally eſteemed to be as competent judges in this caſe as any whatever, that the Allegorical Interpretation of Job is entirely groundleſs, or, if you pleaſe, falſe; for that for my part I cannot find any traces in it of the manners, rites, or affairs of the Iſraelites. You ſay, "you believe moſt competent readers are agreed, that there are *infinitely more and ſtronger marks* that the affairs under the Theocracy are alluded to, than that Auguſtus is ſhadowed under Virgil's Hero." A very modeſt recounting of preſumptive votes in your favour truly! I am as fully perſuaded as I can be upon any ſuch point, that there neither is, was, or ever will be, I do not ſay ſuch an agreement of moſt competent readers, but any one competent reader in the world of this opinion; nor can I believe that, with all the prejudice of hypotheſis poſſeſſing you, you can upon recollection poſſibly think ſo yourſelf. —— But as for my expreſſions which you object to; if you had uſed the ſame upon a like occaſion in your writings, I believe they never would have been ſelected as remarkably deficient in point of civility and decency, nor as the moſt flagrant inſtance to be found there of the Dogmatical.

The next paſſage in the ſame page you give up, and allow that it could not be meant of you; but think that I ought to have diſtinguiſhed your Allegory from that of others. I ſhould rather have

reſtrained

reſtrained it, by my expreſſion, as well as by the circumſtances, to thoſe whom it only concerned: I ſhould have ſaid *quibuſdam* Allegoriæ conquiſitoribus; and I will correct it ſo, if ever I have an opportunity. As to my admitting Solomon's Song to be an Allegory, at the ſame time that I denied Job to be ſuch; it was, I aſſure you, neither out of perverſeneſs with regard to you, nor for fear of appearing unorthodox. I think there is a material difference between the two caſes: if you deny Job to be an Allegory, I ſee no ill conſequence; it ſtands juſt where it did: but if you deny that Solomon's Song is an Allegory, you muſt exclude it from the Canon of Holy Scripture; for it holds its place there by no other tenure. You may laugh at me, but I am really in earneſt in ſaying, that I am inclined to think Solomon's Song to be altogether Allegorical: I have given my reaſons for it; and do not yet think the difficulties that ſtand in the way of the Allegorical Interpretation equal to that of ſuppoſing, that Ezra, or whoever they were that ſettled the Canon of Scripture, would ever have admitted a looſe and profane Poem into the number and rank of their Sacred and Inſpired Writings.

You are pleaſed to ſay, " that the general turn of my Letter is to ſhew you, that you are unreaſonable in expecting common civilities from me, in a book where you lay ſo much in my way." Give me leave to ſtate my deſign, as I imagine, more juſtly:

juſtly: it was to ſhew you, that you did not lie ſo much in my way, as to have made it either neceſſary, or proper, or indeed not even extremely impertinent, for me to have entered into a diſpute with you. If I had really, as you ſay, neglected paying you common reſpect, or declined it for fear of giving offence, you might eaſily have ſuggeſted to yourſelf a proper plea for the prudence and juſtneſs of my conduct. To profit by the experience of others is the beſt uſe one can make of Knowledge of the world: the experiment of paying you a proper reſpect on a like occaſion had not ſucceeded well with others; a ſufficient reaſon why I ſhould not try it again. For inſtance, and it is a caſe in point; the Learned and Ingenious Dr Grey gave an Edition of Job, and in his Preface had occaſion to ſpeak of the ſeveral prevailing opinions concerning the deſign of the Book; he found himſelf obliged to diſſent from you; he expreſſed his diſſent in a decent manner; he treated you with candor, civility, and reſpect. What was the conſequence? you were highly offended; you looked upon him as an enemy, marked him as an object of your reſentment, and treated him in a manner equally unworthy of him and yourſelf. After this you ought not to wonder, if no writer on Job ſhould care to have any thing to ſay to you.

To have done with Job: I cannot help noting another paſſage of mine upon that ſubject, which you have introduced for no other purpoſe but to

pervert

pervert and ridicule it. I am manifeſtly ſpeaking p. 326, of an improvement that might have been made in proceſs of time and by a ſucceſſion of writers; as was the caſe with the Greeks, whoſe advances in this way I obſerve were very ſlow: you dexterouſly ſlip in *the Compoſer*, as if I had ſaid that *He* was capable of making it himſelf; and then laugh at me for an abſurdity of which you are the author. I mention this as another inſtance to ſhew, that you did not read me with that candor and equity which is every writer's due. I ſuppoſe ſome friend of yours, who in the immoderate warmth of his affection reſolves to keep you to himſelf by ſetting you at variance with the reſt of the world, had prejudiced you againſt me, by informing you, that I had treated you with diſreſpect. In conſequence of which, you read my book through with the ſame ſpirit, which you have ſhewn in your gloſs upon the parts produced in your letter; and I need not be ſurpriſed to find, that you thought the Author, as well as the Book, made up of perverſeneſs, abſurdity, and nonſenſe.

You gueſs the true reaſon of my not being afraid of you; and I will give you the reaſon, why I told you ſo. After what your Friend had publiſhed to the world, and what you had ſaid yourſelf, (for your demand of an explanation was attended with a ſort of denunciation of your reſentment, in caſe of a refuſal, or an unſatisfactory account of myſelf) I thought it incumbent upon me to tell you explicitly, and to repeat it, that I was not to be

frightened. I ſhould not have thought of ſetting forth my bravery, if I had not firſt been called a Coward, and accordingly looked upon as one that was to be awed by menaces.

I have now conſidered all your complaints; and ſince we are upon the buſineſs of expoſtulation, and as I hope for the laſt time, you muſt give me leave in my turn to make my own. It is not in behalf of myſelf, but of one for whom I am much more concerned, that is, my Father. In your Julian you bring a heavy charge againſt him of Uncharitableneſs. I have ſeveral objections to the whole paſſage, which I ſhall propoſe to you as diſtinctly as I can.

I. In charging him ſo ſeverely, you do not quote his words; or ſo much as ſay, when or where theſe uncharitable reflections were made: ſo that not one in a hundred perhaps of your readers will know, where to find what he has ſaid, and ſo be able to examine, whether you have charged him juſtly or not.

II. You ſay, that theſe reflections ſtand in the place of a confutation: whereas the confutation precedes them. Mr L. charges Baſnage with wilfully ſuppreſſing the unexceptionable evidence of an honeſt contemporary Heathen, Ammian. Marcellinus: which is as much to the purpoſe in one line, and will go as far towards invalidating his judgement upon the caſe, as all that Criticiſm which you have diſplayed through ſo many pages.

III. You miſrepreſent what he has ſaid: I muſt ſet before you his words; "ſed profecto," ut obſervat

ſervat Iſ. Voſſius, " nullos religio Chriſtiana infen-
" ſiores habet hoſtes, quam ipſos Chriſtianos :"
aut ſaltem qui nomine tenus Chriſtiani videri vo-
lunt : quales ſunt Tan. Faber, Jac. Tollius, aliique
iſtius Commatis Critici. The words *quales ſunt*
plainly relate to thoſe only, qui nomine tenus Chri-
ſtiani videri volunt ; and neither of theſe clauſes
includes Baſnage. If Mr L. had intended to in-
clude him, he ought to have ſaid, quales ſunt *ipſe*
Baſnagius, Tan. Faber, &c. or quales *etiam* ſunt
T. Faber, &c. or rather he could not have uſed at
all with any propriety thoſe words of Voſſius, who
ſpeaks of *Sincere* Chriſtians doing diſſervice to the
cauſe of Chriſtianity : (De Sybil. Orac. Cap. XI.)
Mr L. accordingly cenſures Baſnage, as a Chriſtian
and a *real* friend, for his indiſcretion and perverſe
oppoſition in this particular caſe ; for a conduct
which you allow to be *moſt provoking*, and ſuch *as*
cannot but give offence to every ſober reader. His cenſure
upon him is carried no further than the words of
Voſſius, and really amounts to no more than what
you have beſtowed on him yourſelf. Your remarks
on what Mr L. has ſaid relate to Baſnage only : Faber
and Tollius you leave to ſhift for themſelves ; and
they were not either of them Miniſters of the Goſpel :
ſo that your laboured amplification, by which you
do all you can to aggravate the charge of uncharita-
bleneſs, falls intirely to the ground, as being built
only on your own uncharitable miſrepreſentation.

IV. It would have been more generous and juſt
in you to have acknowledged yourſelf indebted to

Mr L. for the Application of the meteoric appearance of Croſſes from Cauſaubon's Adverſaria to this Subject; which, when it appeared in your more popular Volume, was received with applauſe, as new and very ingenious; an applauſe which, as you could not but know, belonged to him.

I flatter myſelf that you will acknowledge the truth of theſe remarks; and expect, that when you give a new Edition of your Julian you will do Mr L. common juſtice by rectifying all the above particulars.

You conclude your Letter with ſaying ſomething of me and of yourſelf. What you ſay of me is much more than I deſerve; but you qualify it by intimating, that you found me the very reverſe of my book. Let us e'en compound the matter between the Book and the Author: abate a good deal of one ſide and of the other, and I ſhall be ſatisfied. What you ſay of yourſelf, of your deſigns and your diſpoſition, I moſt readily believe to be true: and aſſure yourſelf, that I always have been, and ſhall be, as ready to acknowledge upon all proper occaſions the ſuperiority of your Genius, your Learning, and your abilities. I do but join with many other ſincere well-wiſhers to you in regretting, that you have not ſomething more of the Spirit of Toleration in Literary matters; that you are ſo haſty in taking up your reſentments, and that you treat ſuch as differ from you in ſo ſevere, and ſo contemptuous a manner.

For

For myſelf as a Member of the Commonwealth of Letters, I am a true Lover of peace and quietneſs, of mutual freedom, candor, and benevolence. I deteſt and I deſpiſe the Squabbles that are perpetually ariſing from the jealouſy and peeviſhneſs of the *genus irritabile Scriptorum.* I am a ſtaunch Republican and a zealous Proteſtant in Literature, nor will ever bear with a Perpetual Dictator, or an Infallible Pope, whoſe Decrees are to be ſubmitted to without appeal, and to be received with implicit aſſent. *Manus hæc inimica tyrannis.* My favourite Principle is the Liberty of Prophecying, and I will maintain it with my laſt breath.

With regard to you in particular, depend upon my ſincerity when I aſſure you, that I ſhall not only always honour you as a man of the firſt rank in Letters, but ſhall be heartily diſpoſed to cultivate your acquaintance, and to merit your good opinion; ſhall be glad of every opportunity of enjoying the pleaſure and profit of your converſation; and moſt willing to enter into as near an intercourſe with you as you ſhall be pleaſed to permit, as a Neighbour, a Member of the ſame Society, and a Friend.

I am with great Truth and Reſpect,

Dear Sir,

Your moſt obedient and

Faithful humble Servant,

R. L.

LETTER IV.

To The Reverend Dr L.

Groſvener Square Oct. 12. 1756.

Dear Sir,

I HAVE this moment received the favour of your long letter of the 6th, it having been ſent me hither from Prior Park.

I had a great deal to ſay to the contents. In ſome places you have ſhewn I was miſtaken, in others you have convinced me I was not. And if you have ſhewn me I have here and there miſtaken your meaning, I have my revenge very amply, if I could take any pleaſure in it, in ſeeing you are as totally miſtaken in my moral character. But you have ſhut my mouth for ever on the ſubject of your letter; by the information you impart to me in the concluſion, namely that the Mr L. who ſent a few notes to Reading the Editor of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, was your Father. I had not the leaſt ſuſpicion of it, when I pretended to take your uſage of me unkindly in your Prelections. Had I known that, I ſhould not only have forborn complaining, but have applauded your piety. The injurer of your Father's memory (and ſuch you took me to be

be, as appears by what you ſay here) deſerved no quarter from you. And this but gives me one reaſon more to eſteem you. And that I may not continue worſe in your eſteem than I deſerve, give me leave to tell you I am no plagiary of your Father's obſervations. By an odd fancy to a ſtrange unequal writer, I had read Meric Caſaubon's writings thro' and thro'. And I had finiſhed my book of Julian, and it was half printed off, when Dr Jorten wrote me word of this note of Mr L.'s. This is a point of honour in which I am particularly delicate. I will venture to boaſt again to you in this, that I believe no Author was ever more averſe to take to himſelfe any thing that belonged to another. However I owe ſo much to your piety, which is really edifying, as to ſtrike out that note againſt your Father, the very firſt opportunity. It is to this likewiſe, that I am ready to ſacrifice every diſguſt that ſome parts of your laſt might be naturally ſuppoſed to give me; as where you leave the queſtion between us, and dictate to me like a tutor or Pedagogue on my general conduct towards others; in which it is not to be ſuppoſed you could be acquainted with the whole of the caſe, or know my particular provocations, as in the caſe of Gray. I have ſaid to the world, (and they ought to believe me or diſprove me) that I had treated no man roughly, who had not firſt fallen upon me. But I thought it both below me, and impertinent in it ſelfe, to acquaint the public with the particulars. In a word, I repeat it once again, that my uſing your

your Father with diſreſpect amply juſtified you for every thing I complained of. But (for all I ſaid there, and when I ſaid it) I honoured his memory as one of the moſt learned Perſons of a better Age, if he was, as I ſuppoſe he might be, the Author of the Comments &c. And be aſſured, I eſteem it not amongſt the leaſt of his ſervices to the Public, that he produced you with the reſt of his works. I accept with all cordiality the offer of your friendſhip. You know the worſt of me, and perhaps have given credit to a great deal more than the worſt, I mean the calumnies of my Enemies; for the future you are to believe only as you find.

I am, Dear Sir, Your very faithful

and affectionate humble Servant,

W. W.

P. S. I am here in waiting. I mention it to you from a ſelfiſh view. *Regis* of this month is dying. What ſhould hinder your ſtepping into his place? it would ſurely be the eaſier, for there are now three or four vacancies amongſt the Chaplains by deaths and removals, and it would be an acquiſition to me to have you in this month.

LETTER V.

To The Reverend Dr W.

Wincheſter Oct. 14. 1756.

Dear Sir,

I CANNOT omit the firſt opportunity of acknowledging the favour of your very obliging Letter, which is juſt now come to my hands.

I was unwilling to open my complaint to you relating to my Father, till I had, as I thought, totally removed the foundation of your exceptions againſt me. You allow, that I had no reaſon to go out of my way to pay you any particular compliment; and you muſt give me leave ſtill to aver, that on the other hand I have not, upon that or any other account, gone out of my way with deſign to reflect upon you. To what I have already offered upon this head, I might add that the Argument and Subſtance of the XXXII[d] and XXXIII[d] Lectures, which ſeem chiefly to give you diſguſt, were drawn up to the ſame effect, as they now appear, ſome years before your Julian was publiſhed; as I could prove to you inconteſtibly, if required, by the original papers, and by the teſtimony of the Biſhops

of Oxford, Rocheſter, and Norwich, and ſeveral other learned Friends, whom I conſulted upon my whole Plan. I ſimply purſued my plan, and differed from you no otherwiſe than I did from many other eminent writers, againſt whom I could have no prejudice. I thought there was no need of being tender in delivering one's opinion upon a ſubject of ſuch doubtful diſputation as Job: *nulli gravis eſt percuſſus Achilles.* However ſince it has happened contrary to my expectation, in return for your very obliging Conceſſion in regard to my Father, I will very readily endeavour to ſoften or alter any expreſſions which ſtill offend you, and which you ſhall mark to me as ſuch, as far as I can do it conſiſtently with my general Theſis. In excuſe for what may offend you in my laſt, I might alledge, that I have ſaid nothing but what ſome paſſages in your Letter gave me, not only a fair opportunity, but a right to ſay: — but I am unwilling to reſume this ſubject; and take much more pleaſure in returning you my ſincereſt thanks for your very obliging expreſſions of all ſorts. Thoſe of your Poſt-ſcript are particularly ſo in every reſpect; and the reaſon you are ſo kind as to give for your mentioning the thing, would really be a great inducement to me to think of it. But my ambition is at an end; and otherwiſe an attendance of this ſort would be extremely inconvenient to me in my preſent ſituation.

I write this in a very great hurry, as you may well imagine, when I tell you, I am preparing to remove

remove with my Family to Durham the beginning of next week. I hope I ſhall there have frequent opportunities of improving the friendſhip which you ſo generouſly offer me, and which I ſhall highly eſteem; and of demonſtrating in every way which lies in my power the ſincerity with which I am,

Dear Sir,

Your moſt faithful and

affectionate humble Servant,

R. L.

To the Reverend Dr. BROWN.

SIR,

THE letter, which you have been pleaſed to addreſs to me from the preſs, is come to my hands. When I firſt ſaw your advertiſement, accompanied with a motto, which ſeemed to intimate your deſign; I was wholly at a loſs to gueſs, how you intended to proſecute that deſign. I was not conſcious to myſelf of having *filched from you your good name*; and I could not conceive, how you would furniſh out a pamphlet upon that topic. When I came to read your letter, I was very much ſurprized to find, that you had collected together, from my letter to the author of Divine Legation, a heap of what you call *injurious inſinuations*, and had charged me with having *attacked your moral character*. I apprehend, that you have very much miſtaken me; and that the charge, which you have brought againſt me, is deſtitute of ſufficient foundation.

To come to particulars: You ſay, that I have clearly marked you out, by referring or alluding to ſeveral paſſages in your writings, which you produce. I will take them in their order.

The firſt is a paſſage in your *Eſſay on Satire.* Now you produce it, I remember to have read it formerly: but I neither did refer to it in my letter aforeſaid, nor had it at all in my thoughts: and I do not believe, that you will get any one perſon in the world to agree with you in thinking, that any thing I have written has the leaſt relation to this paſſage.

The next is a paſſage in the *Eſſays on the Charecteriſtics:* upon which you ſo ſtrongly inſiſt, as to ſay, "that charity itſelf cannot acquit me of an in-"tention of pointing you out." I have read, with much pleaſure, and more than once, your Eſſays on the Characteriſtics; but it was ſome years ago. Upon the late occaſion, I give you my word, I never turned to your book; and the paſſage you produce from it was as totally abſent from my thoughts, and in effect as much unknown to me, as if it had never exiſted.

The third is a paragraph in your *Eſtimate:* this in general I well remembered; though I have not, to the beſt of my recollection, ſo much as ſeen the book within theſe laſt ſix or ſeven years. I did not, either in this, or in any other caſe, ſeek out for paſſages or expreſſions, which I might apply to you. The expreſſion of *beſtriding the narrow world* occurred to me; and in the train of thought, which I was then purſuing, it could not but do ſo.

Since your celebrated application of it, it has been in every one's mouth, and is become in a manner proverbial. It ſuited my purpoſe as a ſtrong image perfectly well adapted to expreſs my idea; and I therefore made uſe of it. At the ſame time, by the aſſociation of ideas, it neceſſarily brought you to my thoughts: I did not ſee why for that reaſon I ſhould reject it; and yet I had no inclination to offend you. This induced me to touch upon it as gently as I could: and pray obſerve, Sir, that agreeably to this intention, and in conſequence of this intention only, I wholly dropt the COLOSSUS, the moſt ſtriking, and the moſt invidious part of the image, and, as you well know by experience, the moſt open to ridicule. You are pleaſed to ſay, that the expreſſion was *your's*, and *your's only*; and that I have marked it in Italics as *ſuch*. Conſider, ſir, a little, I beſeech you: why *your's*, and *your's only?* Why not rather *Shakeſpear's?* You are but the borrower; and any other perſon is ſurely at liberty to borrow it after you, from *Shakeſpear*, the original and ſole proprietor.

I have here explained to you, as faithfully and as exactly as I can, the preciſe ſituation of my mind, while I was writing. As to the diſtinction which you ſo carefully point out to me, namely, that you did not make the application of this paſſage of *Shakeſpear* in your own perſon, but put it into the mouths of thoſe "little aſpiring or deſpairing ſcrib-"blers," of whom you ſpeak; this did not then

lie within the reach of my memory: nor, if it had, would it have been at all to my purpoſe to have taken notice of it. And the utmoſt that you can make of what I have ſaid, by the moſt unfavourable conſtruction with regard to yourſelf, amounts to this, That the Author in queſtion really pretends to be what this Compariſon, by whomſoever ſuppoſed to be uttered, makes him; and that, as I treat this pretenſion as extravagant, I in conſequence repreſent you as having been carried by your "Zeal into "an ill-judged prodigality of praiſe:" an imputation ſurely of no very heinous nature, and which, I ſhould think, hardly demanded of you ſo public a declaration of your reſentment.

The three miniſters of king Picrochole form a general character of a ſet of officious courtiers, who feed the vanity, and ſwell the pride of their great maſter. If any ſuch there be among us, I have left it to the public to find them out; and to their own conſciences, to confirm the application. The ſage Rabelais has diſtinguiſhed them by particular titles. I do not think, that any one of thoſe titles can be ſuppoſed with any propriety to point out you. Why will you then anticipate the judgment of the public? Why will you inſiſt upon it, that you are marked out by a character, which your own conſcience tells you does not belong to you?

Upon the whole, I do not conceive that your charge againſt me, of *injurious inſinuations and an attack*

attack upon your moral character, is raiſed upon any proper foundation. Your ſenſibility upon this tender point, tho' perhaps carried even to an unreaſonable degree of jealouſy, I can very readily excuſe. And further, if you thought, that I afforded you a favourable opportunity of vindicating your injured character, from imputations thrown upon you from other quarters, by producing the authentic teſtimony of original letters, in which you have expreſſed yourſelf with a truly ingenuous ſpirit, an honeſt freedom, and a becoming dignity; if this was your principal intention in thus publicly addreſſing me, I cannot but ſo far approve of your deſign. And if my name has been, in this reſpect, of any ſervice or convenience to you; I aſſure you, you are very welcome to the uſe which you have been pleaſed to make of it on this occaſion.

I am, with a ſincere regard,

Sir,

Your moſt humble Servant,

R. L.

London,
Jan. 13, 1766.

This letter was written the day after Dr. Brown's letter came to hand, And tho' it was ſent, as a private letter, by the poſt; yet, as Dr. Brown's letter came from the preſs, it has been thought proper to communicate a copy of the anſwer to it likewiſe to the Public.

309187